

The author(s) shown below used Federal funds provided by the U.S. Department of Justice and prepared the following final report:

**Document Title: Evaluating Data Collection and Communication
System Projects Funded Under the STOP
Program, Final Project Report**

Author(s): David B Rottman

Document No.: 201510

Date Received: 08/22/2003

Award Number: 96-WT-NX-0002

This report has not been published by the U.S. Department of Justice. To provide better customer service, NCJRS has made this Federally-funded grant final report available electronically in addition to traditional paper copies.

| |
|---|
| <p>Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.</p> |
|---|

201510



PROPERTY OF

National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS)
Box 6000
Rockville, MD 20849-6000

**EVALUATING DATA COLLECTION AND COMMUNICATION SYSTEM PROJECTS
FUNDED UNDER THE STOP PROGRAM**

**National Center for State Courts
96-WT-NX-0002**

**Final Project Report
1996-2001**

FINAL REPORT

Approved By: M. Battell

Date: July 2, 2003

August 30, 2002

Submitted to the National Institute of Justice

This project was supported by grant No. 96-WT-NX-0002 awarded to the National Center for State Courts, by the National Institute of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice. Points of view in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

Table of Contents

| | | |
|-------------|---|-----------|
| I. | Introduction..... | 1 |
| II. | Methodology | 2 |
| III. | Mail Survey (1998/1999 and 2000) | 5 |
| IV. | Interview Findings (1999-2000)..... | 12 |
| V. | Brooklyn and Bronx Case Study (Domestic Violence Court Technology Application and Resource Link) | 20 |
| VI. | Analysis of Data Elements Collected by VAWA STOP Grantees..... | 25 |
| VII. | Conclusion and Recommendations..... | 30 |

APPENDICES

- A. Data Collection Instruments**
- B. Responses to Follow-up Questionnaires**
- C. Full Text of Interview Summaries**

EVALUATING DATA COLLECTION AND COMMUNICATION SYSTEM PROJECTS FUNDED UNDER THE STOP PROGRAM

I. Introduction

In 1996, the National Center for State Courts (NCSC) began an evaluation of data collection and communication system projects undertaken with Violence Against Women Act STOP (Services, Training, Officers, Prosecution) grant funds, which are administered through the Violence Against Women Office (VAWO). This evaluation was one of four evaluations funded by the National Institute of Justice (NIJ) in that year to examine the use of STOP grant funds to address four purpose areas of the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA). These purpose areas included (1) data collection and communication projects; (2) victim services activities (evaluation conducted by the American Bar Association); (3) law enforcement and prosecution activities (evaluation conducted by the Institute for Law and Justice); and (4) activities of Indian tribes receiving STOP Violence Against Indian Women Grants (evaluation conducted by the Tribal Law and Policy Program, University of Arizona).¹ The four purpose area evaluations were intended to complement a more comprehensive national evaluation of STOP projects initiated by the Urban Institute in 1995.²

The Urban Institute created and maintained databases of the information submitted by state STOP coordinators and provided the basic data needed by the NCSC to identify subgrantees that reported using STOP grant funds for data collection or communication system projects. Until 2000, the NCSC submitted annual reports to the Urban Institute for inclusion in its annual report on STOP grant funded activities.

The NCSC's project activities of the first two years entailed primarily (1) coordination efforts with NIJ, the VAWO, and the other four organizations evaluating the STOP program and (2) conducting research on the then-current status of data systems developed to identify and/or address violence against women. One major activity during this time was a detailed examination of the development and implementation of state protection order registries. This information provided a context for examining how the STOP program affected data system development. It also had the added benefit of boosting efforts by

¹ Evaluation of the STOP Formula Grants to Combat Violence Against Women, 1998 Report by the Urban Institute (July 1998).

² The Urban Institute served as the overall evaluation coordinator for the STOP program to enhance the quality of all the evaluations. Attempts were made to avoid duplication of efforts and to minimize burdens on the STOP grantees and subgrantees through such measures as developing consistent data collection protocols and coordinating the timing of surveys and site visits. These efforts met with modest success in the first two years of the evaluation, but became less viable as the number of subgrantees grew each year and the complexities of reporting grant activities to the Violence Against Women Office increased commensurately.

states, tribes, and national organizations to create protection order registries and to implement the full faith and credit provisions of the Violence Against Women Act.

This report synthesizes the activities and findings of the NCSC's evaluation, which have been reported in semi-annual progress reports and annual reports for 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, and 2001. The report focuses on the findings reported for 1998-2001, because these findings address STOP funded efforts to develop or improve data collection and/or communication systems to address violence against women. The activities of the first two years were useful at the time, but the findings from those efforts are now out-of-date and do not pertain significantly to the goal of the NCSC's evaluation.³ In addition to this final report of the evaluation findings, the NCSC has produced a guide for VAWA grantees to use in developing performance measures for their initiatives to reduce violence against women and in designing and implementing data systems to support those initiatives.

II. Methodology

The evaluation methodology entailed mail surveys, telephone interviews with selected subgrantees, and site visits. The methodology evolved from 1998 to 2000 as project staff learned from each successive examination of subgrantees' activities in the data collection and communication purpose area. Throughout the evaluation, staff attempted to minimize burdens on the subgrantees and thereby to encourage a higher response rate. This approach was used because the subgrantees had significant grant reporting requirements and the other STOP evaluators may have been requesting information from them as well.⁴

In early 1998, few projects had been underway for a time period sufficient for the evaluation to investigate their progress. For this reason, the evaluation documented at that point descriptive information reported by these subgrantees to VAWO and used a basic questionnaire to determine how they intended to use STOP grant funds to address the data collection and communication purpose area. In 1999 and 2000, staff refined and expanded the evaluation methodology. In addition to distributing a basic questionnaire, they conducted follow-up mail and telephone surveys with selected subgrantees to document their

³ The findings from this research were published in the Urban Institute's 1998 Report on the STOP evaluation.

⁴ The response rate to the mail survey was 53 percent in 1998/1999, despite follow-up measures taken to increase the rate, and in 2000, the response rate fell to 39 percent. Follow-up attempts were not made in 2000 because the efforts in 1999 had found so few examples of projects that adequately addressed the data collection and communication purpose area. The overall response rates would have been higher if the methodology had entailed telephone interviews for the basic survey. However, the findings from the 53 percent of subgrantees who responded in 1998/1999 suggest that the information gained would not have warranted such a time-consuming effort.

accomplishments. They also visited one subgrantee near the beginning of implementation of its project and after implementation had been completed.

The NCSC received the first database of STOP subgrants from the Urban Institute in March 1998 (a database of 1996 STOP subgrants created from the 1996 Subgrant Award Reports (SARs)). Project staff identified 165 subgrants that reported using at least some part of the grant funds for creating new or improving existing data collection and communication systems. In April 1998, project staff distributed a basic questionnaire (one-page) to solicit more detailed information about (1) how the STOP funds were being used for data collection or communication system projects; (2) which agencies could share or transfer information electronically; and (3) other sources of funding. Seventy-five subgrantees returned the questionnaire.

In September 1998, project staff received an updated Urban Institute database of 1995-98 STOP subgrants (based on the newly developed Subgrant Award and Performance Report (SAPR)). Staff identified 321 subgrants that reported using at least some part of the grant funds for creating new or improving existing data collection and communication systems. Of the 321 subgrants, staff identified the original 165 subgrants plus 156 subgrants that were not included in the first Urban Institute database (1996 SARs). The basic questionnaire was distributed to these 156 subgrantees in November 1998. Project staff also sent the questionnaire again to selected subgrantees that had not returned the questionnaire distributed in April 1998 to the original 165 subgrantees. These subgrantees were selected because an analysis of information from the first Urban Institute database indicated that their data collection or communication system project might be important to document further. Of this group of subgrantees, 76 returned the questionnaire (for a total return of 151 questionnaires).

In January 1999, project staff revised the basic questionnaire based on the experiences of the April and November 1998 surveys. The revised basic questionnaire was sent to the 67 subgrantees that had not returned the original questionnaire distributed in November 1998 (they also received a summary of all 151 questionnaires that had been returned to date from the November and April surveys). Of the subgrantees receiving the revised questionnaire, 23 returned it and 20 of the subgrants were applicable. The total number of 1995-1998 subgrantees returning the questionnaire ultimately was 171, which resulted in a response rate of 53 percent for the basic questionnaire (171 of 321 subgrants).

The findings from the basic survey of these subgrantees, as well as a subsequent basic survey conducted in 2000, are reported in the next section of this report (Section III). In addition to revising the basic questionnaire, project staff developed a follow-up mail questionnaire and a telephone interview protocol, with each subsequent survey instrument drilling deeper into the respondents' information. (These instruments are provided in Appendix A.)

Project staff then selected a sample of 1997-98 subgrantees (80) to be surveyed in more detail. The sample was based on responses to the basic questionnaire indicating that the subgrantee had used STOP funds for activities other than purchasing equipment. These subgrantees were asked to complete a follow-up questionnaire requesting more detailed information on their programs. NCSC project staff then contacted all second survey respondents to confirm information they reported. NCSC project staff conducted an interview with subgrantees that reported having developed an automated data collection or communication system. The findings from the interviews are reported in Section IV of this report.

In 2000, building on their experiences in obtaining data in 1998 and 1999, project staff modified the methodology for examining how subgrantees used grant funds for data collection and communication system projects. The primary reasons for changing the methodology were: (1) the high level of over-reporting in the SAPR database of subgrants using funds for data collection and communication system projects (many subgrantees checked the data collection and communication purpose area items, but did not actually have any project activities significantly related to this area); and (2) the high number of duplicate projects contained in the Urban Institute's database of 1999/2000 subgrantees (as more and more projects were funded and others were renewed, it became more difficult to determine which projects had been surveyed in the past and which of these warranted a second look).⁵

To avoid distributing large numbers of questionnaires to subgrantees that had not used new funds for this purpose area, staff reviewed the database of 1999/2000 subgrants to identify non-duplicate subgrants and determine which subgrantees were most likely to be using their STOP funds in ways that went beyond purchasing equipment. Through this process, staff identified 238 subgrantees to be surveyed.

Of the 238 subgrantees identified, staff selected 193 subgrantees to receive the basic questionnaire. Seventy-six of the 193 subgrantees returned this questionnaire (a 39 percent response rate), and 69 of the 76 subgrantees' projects were applicable. (Despite staff efforts to cull out inapplicable subgrants, several of the selected subgrantees had not used STOP funds for some type of data collection or communication system purpose.)

In addition to the 193 subgrantees selected to receive the basic questionnaire, staff identified 45 subgrantees to receive a longer questionnaire used in 1999 as a follow-up to the basic questionnaire. (The evaluation bypassed the basic survey stage for these subgrantees to reduce the burden of participating in the evaluation.) Fifteen subgrantees returned this questionnaire

⁵ The high proportion of duplicate projects was not a deficiency of the Urban Institute's database, but rather a result of problems in the processes for reporting grant information to VAWO.

(a 33 percent response rate). From the 84 subgrantees that returned either the basic questionnaire or the longer questionnaire staff selected 20 subgrantees for telephone interviews. Nineteen of the subgrantees interviewed had projects reasonably related to achieving the goals of the data collection and communication system purpose area. (The findings from the mail and telephone surveys are reported in Sections III and IV, respectively.)

The last component of the evaluation methodology entailed two visits to one STOP subgrantee, the Center for Court Innovation in New York City. In collaboration with the New York State Office for Court Administration, the Center for Court Innovation (the Center) has implemented an Internet-based intranet system for case processing and tracking defendants' compliance with court ordered batterer intervention and other terms of release. The system was piloted for domestic violence felony cases heard in the Brooklyn Supreme Court's Domestic Violence Court and misdemeanor domestic violence cases heard in the Bronx Criminal Court. STOP grant funds supported the implementation of the data system in the Bronx, while Grants to Encourage Arrest program funds supported development and implementation in Brooklyn. The Center also has developed and recently implemented an electronic order of protection system as a component of the domestic violence case management system. (The Center did use STOP grant funds to develop this system.)

III. Mail Survey Findings (1998/1999 and 2000)

The NCSC evaluation attempted to survey in each successive year only subgrantees that had not previously reported using STOP funds for data collection and communication projects. The responses of subgrantees to a basic questionnaire distributed in 1998/1999 and 2000 indicate few differences in how subgrantees used funds for data collection and communication. Some direct comparisons cannot be made because the information sought in the basic questionnaire changed somewhat from year to year. However, most of the items remained substantially similar.

For example, the relative proportions of subgrantees purchasing hardware and software were high across time (86 percent of subgrantees in 1998/1999 and 65 percent in 2000). The proportions of subgrantees developing or improving case or client tracking systems also remained relatively high across the years, moving up from 47 percent to 58 percent. The proportion of subgrantees using STOP funds for victim notification systems also increased, from 17 to 28 percent. The proportions of subgrantees applying STOP funds to other data or communications system development were fairly stable over time.

These findings suggest that the needs of STOP subgrantees addressing the data collection and communication purpose area have been similar, whether they began projects in the early years of STOP funding or in later years. The rise in subgrantees reporting the use of funds to implement an integrated data system

from 9 percent in 1998/1999 to 17 percent in 2000 is an indication that STOP grantees are improving their technological capacity, whether directly from STOP funds or through other resources. Furthermore, 64 percent of subgrantees responding to the 2000 basic survey reported using STOP funds to improve data collection or statistical reporting of violence against women.⁶

Responses to the 1998/1999 basic survey

In April and November of 1998 and February of 1999, 171 subgrantees reported how they used STOP grant funds for data collection and communication system development or improvement (Table 1). They also reported the ability of their agencies to transfer data electronically with particular agencies (Table 2). Most of the respondents replied that they could not share or transfer data with any other agencies. Among those agencies with which data could be shared, the most frequently identified were local law enforcement, prosecution, and state law enforcement. Project staff subsequently determined that subgrantees interpreted the term "electronically" broadly, in that they most often transferred data via fax or email. For this reason, staff modified the basic questionnaire to better determine the types of electronic transfer methods subgrantees used.

In 1998/1999, the most frequently reported uses of STOP grant funds were to purchase hardware (58 percent) and to develop or improve case or client tracking systems (47 percent). About a third of the subgrantees used funds for interagency coordination or planning for integrated data systems (31 percent) and to purchase software (28 percent), while a quarter (23 percent) of subgrantees purchased communications equipment. About 15 percent of the subgrantees used the funds for training to use data collection or communications systems, to develop or improve victim notification systems, or to develop or improve protection order registries. Few subgrantees were engaged in the more complex activities of establishing communications networks, developing software, or implementing an integrated data system.

⁶ This item was not included in the 1998 basic questionnaire.

Table 1: 1998/1999 Use of Stop Grant Funds (n=171)

| Use of STOP Grant Funds | Number | Percent |
|---|---------------|----------------|
| Purchase hardware | 99 | 58 |
| Develop/improve case/client tracking system | 80 | 47 |
| Interagency coordination/planning for integrated data systems | 53 | 31 |
| Purchase software | 48 | 28 |
| Purchase communications equipment | 40 | 23 |
| Training to use data collection/communication systems | 29 | 17 |
| Develop/improve victim notification system | 29 | 17 |
| Develop/improve protection order registry | 26 | 15 |
| Establish communications network | 16 | 9 |
| Software development | 15 | 9 |
| Implementation of an integrated data system | 15 | 9 |

Table 2: Subgrantees' Ability to Transfer Data Electronically (n=171)

| Agency With Which Information Can Be Shared | Number |
|--|---------------|
| None | 72 |
| Local law enforcement agency | 44 |
| Prosecutor | 34 |
| State law enforcement agency | 30 |
| Courts | 28 |
| Corrections agency/jail | 23 |
| Probation | 16 |
| Other victim services | 12 |
| Shelters | 11 |
| Federal law enforcement agency | 9 |
| Sexual assault crisis center | 8 |
| Hospitals | 3 |

Responses to the 2000 Basic Survey

In the spring of 2000, 69 subgrantees reported how they used STOP grant funds for data collection and communication system development or improvement (Table 3). They also reported the agencies with which they share information (Table 4) and how the information is shared (Table 5). The data reported in Tables 3-5 are current as of July 1, 2000.

In 2000, the most frequently reported uses of STOP grant funds were to purchase hardware or software (65 percent), to develop or improve data collection and statistical reporting (64 percent), and to develop or improve case

or client tracking systems (58 percent). Over a third of the subgrantees used the funds to coordinate or plan for an integrated data system (35 percent). Lower proportions of the subgrantees used STOP grant funds to implement an integrated data system (17 percent), to develop or improve a protection order registry (17 percent), to develop software (12 percent), or to establish communications networks (10 percent).

Table 3: Uses of STOP Grant Funds for Data Collection and Communication: 2000 (n=69)

| Use of STOP Grant Funds | Number | Percent |
|--|---------------|----------------|
| Purchase hardware/software | 45 | 65 |
| Develop/improve data collection/statistical reporting | 44 | 64 |
| Develop/improve case/client tracking system | 40 | 58 |
| Interagency coordination/planning for integrated systems | 24 | 35 |
| Purchase communications equipment | 19 | 28 |
| Develop/improve victim notification system | 19 | 28 |
| Training personnel | 14 | 20 |
| Develop/improve protection order registry | 12 | 17 |
| Implementation of an integrated data system | 12 | 17 |
| Software development | 8 | 12 |
| Establish communications network | 7 | 10 |

Of the 69 subgrantees reporting how they used STOP grant funds, 93 percent reported that they shared information with at least one other agency. The subgrantees most commonly shared information with law enforcement (84 percent) and victim services (83 percent). Prosecution (65 percent) and the courts (62 percent) were the next most frequently mentioned recipients of information, followed by probation, corrections, or jail (49 percent).

Table 4: Inter-Agency Information Sharing Among Subgrantees (n=69)

| Agency with Which Information is Shared | Number | Percent |
|--|---------------|----------------|
| Law enforcement | 58 | 84 |
| Victim services | 57 | 83 |
| Prosecution | 45 | 65 |
| Courts | 43 | 62 |
| Probation, corrections, jail | 34 | 49 |
| Other agencies | 16 | 23 |

The majority of the subgrantees that shared data with another agency used more than one means to do so (78 percent). Most subgrantees transferred or exchanged information by the more traditional methods of telephones and faxes (88 percent). Only a small proportion of the subgrantees transfer or

exchange data electronically (7 percent), but 12 percent of the subgrantees reported having remote electronic access to another agency's data and 20 percent share a common database. This suggests that agencies at least are moving in the direction of data sharing.

Table 5: Mechanisms Subgrantees Used to Share Information (n=69)

| Mechanisms Used to Share Information | Number | Percent |
|--|---------------|----------------|
| Transfer/exchange via phone/fax | 61 | 88 |
| Transfer/exchange via non-electronic means | 40 | 58 |
| Transfer/exchange via email | 29 | 42 |
| Integrated data networks (sharing common database) | 14 | 20 |
| Remote electronic access to other agency's data | 8 | 12 |
| Transfer/exchange via electronic means | 5 | 7 |

Responses to the 1999 and 2000 Follow-up Questionnaires

A total of 51 subgrantees completed and returned the follow-up questionnaires in the 1999 and 2000 surveys (36 of 80 subgrantees surveyed in 1999 and 15 of 45 subgrantees surveyed in 2000). In these surveys, subgrantees reported information about their agency, the geographic scope of the project, the timing and level of STOP funding for their project, what types of data they collected and with whom it was shared, how information in their data or communication system was used, and how the data or communication system had affected their response to violence against women.

This section of the report discusses responses to selected items of the follow-up questionnaire that indicate how the STOP grant program affected the subgrantees' capacity to address violence against women (see Table 6). Items related to data collection are discussed in Section VI. (The responses to all items in both the 1999 and 2000 questionnaires are presented in Appendix B. They are current as of June 30, 1999 and May 30, 2000, respectively.)

Although the responses of 51 subgrantees cannot be generalized to all the subgrantees that engaged in data collection or communication system projects, they do provide an indication that these funds have enhanced the subgrantees' capacity to address violence against women. Sixty-one percent of these subgrantees reported that they can base decisions on more reliable or immediate information in the system. Over half of the subgrantees (55 percent) said they are better able to provide services to victims because communications across systems have been enhanced, while nearly a half (49 percent) report stronger linkages across agencies to provide a more coordinated response to victims. Over a third of these subgrantees (35 percent) said that victim safety has been increased through notification measures made possible by their projects.

Other important aspects of the projects reported by subgrantees include: improved police response because information on prior incidents is available (25 percent), increased batterer accountability through compliance tracking (25 percent), stronger enforcement of protection orders made possible by central registries (20 percent), improved case tracking by prosecutors (20 percent), more sentencing enhancements for repeat offenders (18 percent), and earlier identification of domestic violence and sexual assault cases (12 percent). Nearly half the subgrantees (47 percent) reported they are collecting statistical data to determine the effects of the data or communication system on their response to violence against women.

The responses from these subgrantees also suggest that the STOP grant funds were essential to improving this capacity. For example, 65 percent of these subgrantees reported that the likelihood of their project developing without STOP funds was low or very low. Unfortunately, 29 percent of the subgrantees said their project was not likely to continue without STOP grant funds. However, 43 percent of the subgrantees reported either that permanent financial support was in the agency's budget or plans were in place to permanently fund the system. Over half the subgrantees (55 percent) reported having no data or communication system before they received STOP funds, and a third had only a manual data collection system. These responses suggest that for many subgrantees, STOP funds have been the catalyst for securing institutional support.

The most common use of data was to track domestic violence activity (35 percent of subgrantees). In consonance with reports of improved communications across systems, 57 percent of subgrantees reported exchanging information within the justice system or among victim services. Half the subgrantees used their data to generate scheduled reports. Other frequently reported uses of the data included tracking activity (defendant/batterer history, client history, stalking, and, in lower proportions, clients' and defendants' use of services) and monitoring system performance (case processing by police, prosecutors and courts). About a quarter of subgrantees reported using data for evaluation and research.

**Table 6: Selected Evaluation Measures From 1999/2000 Follow-up
Questionnaires (n=51)**

| Questions | Number | Percentage |
|---|--------|------------|
| Has the existence of this data collection/communication system affected your response to violence against women in any of the following ways? | | |
| More reliable/immediate information on which to base decisions | 31 | 61% |
| Better able to provide services to victims because of enhanced communication across agencies | 28 | 55% |
| Stronger linkages across agencies to provide a more coordinated response to victims | 25 | 49% |
| Increased victim safety through notification measures | 18 | 35% |
| Improved police response due to available information on prior incidents | 13 | 25% |
| Increased batterer accountability through the ability to track compliance | 13 | 25% |
| Stronger enforcement of protection orders through their collection in a centralized registry | 10 | 20% |
| Increased case tracking for district attorney accountability | 10 | 20% |
| Sentencing enhancements for repeat offenders not previously tracked | 9 | 18% |
| Earlier identification of domestic violence/sexual assault cases | 6 | 12% |
| Are you gathering information to measure how this data system has affected your response to violence against women? | | |
| Yes, statistical data | 24 | 47% |
| No | 19 | 37% |
| Yes, ratings from victims | 8 | 16% |
| Yes, other type(s) of information | 7 | 14% |
| Yes, ratings from system users | 4 | 8% |
| How likely would a data collection/communication system have been developed in your jurisdiction without STOP grant funds? | | |
| Very unlikely/unlikely | 33 | 65% |
| Somewhat unlikely | 9 | 18% |
| Will this data collection/communication system be maintained without STOP grant funds (i.e., incorporated into organization's operating budget)? | | |
| Project is not likely to continue without STOP grant funds | 15 | 29% |
| Permanent financial support already included in budget | 14 | 27% |
| Plans are in place to permanently fund the system | 8 | 16% |

| Questions | Number | Percentage |
|---|--------|------------|
| Did you have any type of data collection/communication system supporting VAWA purposes prior to receipt of STOP grant funds? | | |
| No | 28 | 55% |
| Yes, manual data collection | 17 | 33% |
| Yes, inter-agency electronic communication via FAX | 6 | 12% |
| Yes, intra-agency data system | 4 | 8% |
| Yes, intra-agency electronic communication | 3 | 6% |
| Other data collection or communication system | 3 | 6% |
| Yes, inter-agency electronic communication via domestic violence/stalking listserv | 2 | 4% |
| Inter-agency integrated data system consisting of a shared database/communications network | 2 | 4% |
| Yes, inter-agency electronic communication via e-mail | 1 | 2% |
| How is the information in the data collection/communication system used (or will it be used)? | | |
| Tracking domestic violence activity | 35 | 69% |
| Information exchange within the justice system or victim services | 29 | 57% |
| Generating scheduled reports/statistics | 26 | 51% |
| Tracking defendant/batterer history | 20 | 39% |
| Generating ad hoc reports/statistics | 20 | 39% |
| Internal evaluation | 20 | 39% |
| Monitoring police case processing | 19 | 37% |
| Tracking client history | 19 | 37% |
| Monitoring prosecutorial case processing | 18 | 35% |
| Tracking stalking activity | 17 | 33% |
| Monitoring court case processing | 17 | 33% |
| Evaluation of STOP grant-funded project activities | 14 | 27% |
| External evaluation | 13 | 25% |
| Research | 13 | 25% |
| Tracking client's use of services | 10 | 20% |
| Tracking defendant/batterer use of services | 10 | 20% |

IV. Interview Findings (1999-2000)

Telephone interviews with 46 STOP subgrantees (27 in 1999 and 19 in 2000/2001) provided a closer view of the types of activities subgrantees identified as data and communication system projects. The interviews revealed that subgrantees used varying definitions for software and hardware communications network, training, development, and, most particularly, integration. Software included office automation software, forms development software, database management software, and database development software. Hardware was defined variously as personal computers, radio repeaters, and video or still cameras, as well as hardware to support network infrastructure. A

communications network might be defined as a telephone notification protocol for shelter vacancies or availability of services for batterers or victims.

Training for most subgrantees was not focused on using the data or communication equipment or system, but instead encompassed training of law enforcement, prosecutors, and community stakeholders in the indicators of domestic violence, creation and implementation of a safety plan, and the completion of domestic violence incident reports. Development covered a wide range of objectives, from creating forms and curriculum to building case management and services management systems. Integration most typically included regular communication of information by any means, not typically electronic, among justice partners and non-governmental entities responding to domestic violence.

For many of these subgrantees, data collection and communication equipment were subsidiary aspects of the STOP-funded project. Several programs used computers to collect and compile data, but few subgrantees reported that they analyzed the data to assess the quality of their operations or services. Several subgrantees collected data solely for the purpose of meeting grant reporting requirements. Data collection aimed at increasing the total knowledge base of violence against women at either the individual case level or aggregate level was less typical.

The variety of data collection and communication system projects reflects differences in the degree to which state STOP grant administrators applied standards for or coordinated the use of STOP funds to support data collection and communication systems. One project enabled a subgrantee to go beyond collecting data related to its operations to provide statistical information for local, state, and national reporting, yet the subgrantee had to manually compute its statistics due to the limitations of the database it created. The subgrantee indicated that its efforts would have been improved if the state had made greater efforts to develop unified and standardized reporting protocols and to facilitate coordination and networking among agencies.

Many statewide and some local projects achieved greater success in meeting the goals outlined by VAWA through more coordinated efforts. For example, the Council Against Domestic Violence in Lansing, Michigan networked PCs from the Protection Order Office in the courthouse to the court clerk's information system to track and monitor the progress of protection order cases through the court process.

Another coordinated project was implemented by Delaware, which requires gun owners who are subject to a protection order (PFA) to relinquish firearms. Delaware developed an automated printed notice to the registered owner when the PFA is issued. A component of this system application monitors the gun owner's compliance with the relinquishment notice. In Delaware's

project, STOP subgrant funds were used for a limited and narrowly targeted purpose, but the project fit within the context of a thriving, integrated environment already addressing issues of violence against women. Delaware's advantage of implementing a range of strategies allowed the specificity of this funding to fill a fundamental gap and enhance the delivery of justice services overall. This is in contrast to other narrowly targeted projects where overall goals have not been defined nor are projects synergistically linked to provide a strategic approach to resolving the problems of violence against women.

A third example of a data collection and communication system developed within a coordinated system response to violence against women is the Rapid Enforcement and Containment Tracking (REACT) program established by the Miami Police Department. The data collection and communication system portion of the project is a local area network consisting of two PCs and five laptop computers connected to a central server to support the REACT unit. The overall goals of the REACT program are to raise awareness of domestic violence in all segments of the community, to identify potentially volatile situations, and to promote the use of appropriate services before violence or more serious violence occurs. Law enforcement officers responding to calls for service are trained to gather information to assess the offender's risk for domestic violence regardless of the type of call. The information is communicated to the REACT unit, which analyzes the offender's level of risk. The REACT unit also participates in all fatality reviews, which enables it to continually evaluate the validity and scope of its risk factors. Information currently collected tracks identified high-risk offenders through their various contacts with the police department and other components of the justice system. It includes warrant status, incident and arrest data, reasons for declining prosecution, services offered to and used by the offender, pre-trial and post-conviction conditions of release, and case dispositions.

This report highlights seven other grantees that used STOP funds to improve practice and services to address violence against women through the data collection and communication purpose area. Summaries of each of the 46 subgrantees' projects are presented in Appendix C.

Missouri Office of the State Courts' Administrator (Jefferson City, Missouri)

Missouri is one of the first states to permit electronic filing of personal protection orders. This project is known as the "Quick File" project. STOP grant funds provided \$22,000 to the Missouri Office of the State Courts' Administrator to pilot web-based electronic filing of personal protection orders in Jackson County, Kansas City, Missouri. Three domestic violence shelters participated in the electronic filing program. A portion of the VAWA funds was utilized to purchase a computer and a printer and to provide a small stipend to each shelter for monthly telephone access. Each of the shelters has free Internet access

through the Missouri Research and Education Network. The remaining VAWA funds were used to contract with software development trainers to train Judicial Branch staff to develop the Lotus Notes based website. The electronic filing system for personal protection orders resides on this website. The system was designed with extensive security measures to protect communications between the shelters and the court.

Implementing the electronic filing system required modifications to legal and procedural rules. For example, the judicial branch passed special rules of court authorizing the electronic filing of protection orders and the use of digital signatures. As of June 2000, 76 petitions had been filed electronically. Fifty-four of the filings were after the pilot funding ended. Although the VAWA funds have been depleted, electronic filing is still in operation today. For a complete review of the pilot project, see *STOP Grant Final Report: Court and Shelter Collaboration Project*, February 26, 1999. This Report explains the development and implementation of the web-based electronic filing and sample web pages. The Report also identifies barriers to and enhancers of success.

It is anticipated that this technology could be expanded to include access through law enforcement agencies, prosecutors, and public defender's offices. A subcommittee of the family court committee has been developing standardized forms to facilitate statewide rollout of electronic filing. As of May 2001, the forms are still in committee undergoing the review process. Pursuant to court rule, the Missouri Supreme Court must review and approve all protection order forms. Once the Supreme Court approves the forms, the "Quick File" committee will then begin the process of incorporating the forms into the electronic filing mechanism and determining the feasibility of the statewide implementation of electronic filing protection orders. This will involve a technical assessment of the current electronic filing system and potential modifications and upgrades in anticipation of statewide rollout. The issue of additional funding also must be considered. The Office of the State Courts' Administrator hopes to obtain additional VAWA STOP Grant funds to fund this effort.

Iowa State Court Administrator's Office, Des Moines, Iowa

STOP grant funds provided \$200,000 to the Iowa State Court Administrator's Office to improve enforcement of protection orders throughout the state. A state-wide task force established in 1993 had determined that there was no effective enforcement of protection orders within the state. At least half of the courts were not automated and protection orders were not entered into any central database. In "Phase I" of the STOP Grant funding cycle, STOP Grant funds were used to create a database for dispatchers to enter the information into the Department of Public Safety (DPS) Iowa On-line Warrants and Articles (IOWA) system. Courts provided information about protection orders to local dispatch personnel who loaded this information into the DPS mainframe database. In addition to domestic abuse orders, the IOWA system contains

information about missing/wanted persons and warrants; it is queried regularly by law enforcement for routine police work.

During Phase II of the STOP Grant cycle, STOP funds were used to develop a system to upload protection order information entered into the court's computer system into the DPS system and subsequently to the NCIC protection order database. The system allows court clerks to enter protection order information into the DPS mainframe on a real time basis. The state has uniform orders of protection, but not all judges use the uniform order or use the order in the same way. Clerks load the following information into their system which is uploaded into DPS's mainframe: the existence of an order, expired orders, violations of the order, modifications, and a general screen that notifies the inquirer to see a copy of the order. Hard copies of the orders are maintained county by county in all of the sheriff's departments in the state. There is also a feature in the system that allows law enforcement to enter criminal notations into the system. However, these notations are eliminated once the court clerk makes an entry that modifies the original order. To date, this continues to be an on-going problem that is not easily solved.

Law enforcement personnel have access to this system, but courts do not have direct access to it. Law enforcement personnel include state police, local police, probation, corrections, and batterer intervention programs that can access the information through the correctional link. Prosecutors can also use the system, but they must have an Iowa DPS terminal and require certification for access. Some prosecutors' offices have taken advantage of this access. Protection orders also are linked with police warrants information. Any time a warrant is issued or executed, the police can check to see if a protection order is on file, and if there is they can serve it on the individual along with the warrant. Courts do not have direct access to the DPS. Therefore, they use a limited court database that shows information for one county only.

As of June 2001, efforts continued to link the courts with the DPS system. The current plan involves a highly technical solution--periodic retrieval of protection order information from the DPS system by the court. It is anticipated that this retrieval will take place 2-3 times per day. The retrieved information will be stored in a court database that is connected with all court information. The court designed a preloaded feature that will retrieve domestic violence information and history on defendants scheduled for "first appearance" in the criminal court the following day. Applications will also be designed for the judges to run more general queries. It is anticipated that there will be an icon that will permit judges to run queries on "walk in" traffic. For example, judges reviewing applications for protective orders will be able to determine whether there is a competing protection order in their own jurisdiction or in another Iowa jurisdiction. Judges will also be able to retrieve "foreign order" information if entered into the DPS system.

This DPS retrieval module was to be piloted in Polk County (Des Moines), Iowa in the summer of 2001. Court personnel will monitor the success of the system with the following measures: response to queries occurs within two minutes; application is so user-friendly that training is not required; and search features are sufficiently flexible to find orders with limited information. If all goes well, it is anticipated that statewide rollout will occur in January 2002.

Lawrenceburg Police Department (Lawrenceburg, Tennessee)

The Lawrenceburg Police Department utilized VAWA grant funds as seed money to develop its Domestic Violence Unit by funding specialized personnel, computer and communications equipment, and a patrol car. Most of the VAWA funds were dedicated to the salary and benefits of a domestic violence case assistant. Computer and communication equipment included four personal computers, one NT terminal, an interfacing device with fiber optic cables and associated linking hardware and software to establish Internet linkage with other departments, including the juvenile court. Lawrenceburg identified a juvenile target population based on the domestic violence statistics maintained concurrent with this VAWA grant. Of the total number of domestic violence cases within the city, 48 percent involved juvenile offenders and/or victims. The Domestic Violence Unit can now electronically review court records in abuse and neglect cases, criminal matters, juvenile matters, and personal protection orders. The central dispatch office can access this court information and advise patrol officers responding to a domestic disturbance call if there are cases pending against the perpetrator. To date, the fiber optic linkage has functioned extremely well and has been an invaluable tool for the Domestic Violence Unit.

When the Lawrenceburg Police Department was advised that it was not eligible for 2000-2001 VAWA STOP grant funds, the city of Lawrenceburg assumed full funding of the Domestic Violence Unit because the domestic violence case volume has continually risen. Nearly 50 percent of the cases that come to the Criminal Investigation Division are referred to the Domestic Violence Unit. The Domestic Violence Unit's rising caseload is expected to soon dictate the hiring of additional investigators and case assistants. The success of the Lawrenceburg Police Department's Domestic Violence Unit has been recognized statewide. Several law enforcement agencies have invited members of the Domestic Violence Unit to trainings and speaking engagements in the hopes that Lawrenceburg's success can be replicated.

Women's Resource Center (Beckley, West Virginia)

The Women's Resource Center is the fiduciary of VAWA funding for the Fayette County 911 Dispatch Center. Fayette County is a small community of approximately 46,785. Fayette County 911 Center dispatches for many agencies including: animal control, wrecker services, 17 fire/rescue departments, three ambulance companies, and ten law enforcement agencies. Of approximately 2,500 dispatches resulting in law enforcement response, 15 percent involve domestic violence. With the VAWA monies, Fayette County purchased computer hardware and records management software (known as CRIS-Criminal Records Information System) to enhance its Dispatch Center. Three personal computers and two printers were obtained as a result of the VAWA funding. One of the computers functions as the server for the records management software, one is located in the Dispatch Center for queries, and one computer is located in the sheriff's office and has remote access via modem. Two of these computers are connected to a local area network.

Much research went into the purchase of CRIS. The CRIS system appears to have a very large information capacity with multiple modules that can be added or deleted to address local needs and specifications, as well as keeping mandated criminal reporting information. For example, CRIS compiles and tracks information that is not currently available on NCIC such as suspect information and call location information. There also is a module for personal protection order information, but there is no direct link to the courts. Consequently, law enforcement has access to paper copies of orders only. The majority of the entries into CRIS are from the sheriff's office and the incident-based reporting system. The long-term goal is that Fayette County will have a fully functional computer-aided dispatch center with automatic query capacity.

The Forensic Division, Montana Department of Justice (Missoula, Montana)

The Forensic Division of the Montana Department of Justice received STOP subgrant funds to assist in the development of a DNA database for sexual offenders within the state of Montana. The Forensic Division laboratory uses the polymerase chain reaction typing method for DNA analysis and intends to interface electronically with the FBI Combined DNA Index System (CODIS).

New York Prosecutors Training Institute (Albany, New York)

All New York State prosecutors attend mandatory and on-going legal training from the New York Prosecutors Training Institute (NYPTI). The Training Institute utilized VAWA STOP grant dollars to develop and maintain a statewide legal brief and legal argument bank that includes appellate briefs, motions, and search warrant information related to sexual assault, domestic violence, and stalking cases. The STOP grant funds were used to establish the brief bank,

provide PCs to each District Attorney's office, and pay for the staff attorney time dedicated to updating the information in the electronic system. (VAWA funds have also been used for training prosecutors on sexual assault, domestic violence and stalking. In addition to on-site training programs, NYPTI recently mailed a five page circular to New York State prosecutors discussing "Megan's Law" (sex offender registries), strangulation, and date rape drugs.)

Upon receipt of a legal motion or brief, the attorney reviews the document to make an assessment of the subject matter, the quality of the document, and whether it is a duplicate of a document already in the database. The attorney then removes the specific facts from the document leaving only the legal arguments. Key words are assigned for easy referencing and the document is then loaded into a word-processing unit based on Windows 95. Every District Attorney's Office in the state has access to the brief and argument bank through direct dial access. A dummy terminal is located in each District Attorney's Office and the individual prosecutor downloads the information onto a disc and then takes the disc to his or her desktop computer for further use. Approximately 200 documents are downloaded each month. As of July 2000, all transactions were executed on the NYPTI server. The NYPTI intends that the next generation of the brief bank will be Internet based.

Virginians Against Domestic Violence (Williamsburg, Virginia)

Since 1996, Virginians Against Domestic Violence (VADV) has received and used VAWA funding for systematic and strategic development and implementation of a plan for statewide collection of domestic violence, sexual assault and stalking information. Beginning in 1995, Virginia formed a statewide coalition of domestic violence and sexual assault providers and made efforts to document programs, services and target populations. VADV found that most data collection systems were inadequate and not Y2K compliant. During 1996, STOP funds enabled VADV to continue to meet to work on strategic planning for domestic violence and sexual assault services. One of the first steps involved the identification of a common set of data elements to ensure that all agencies could report the same information. This step evolved into a larger domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking data project, initially involving the preparation of standardized forms to document domestic violence, sexual assault and stalking activity. Among these forms are the documentation of hot line calls, shelter stays, advocacy services, and prevention/education/training services.

In 1997, the project focused on creating a statewide electronic data collection system. Based upon the advice of a consultant, VADV selected a web-based data collection system using a highly secure html format. VAWA funds were utilized to support the development of the software and scripts for data entry into the web-based reporting system. After a six-month pilot period, the system went live and was implemented statewide in October 1999. The website, www.vadata.org, is accessible 24 hours a day/seven days per week. Each

domestic violence agency can access the site and, using an assigned password, enter into the data entry portion of the site. All domestic violence programs are required to participate in this electronic data reporting and must have a computer with Internet capacity. When the system went online, participation by sexual assault agencies was optional because the sexual assault reporting component was not as well developed as the domestic violence module.

The ultimate goals of these data collection efforts are to improve services at the local level to meet the needs of target populations and to change domestic violence policies at the state level. Overall, the Internet-based data collection system is working well and has performed beyond expectations. The sexual assault module is now completed and, although participation by sexual assault agencies is still optional, 85% of sexual assault centers are entering data and information into the system. The information and data extrapolated from the system has been used to enhance operations and increase services to victims across the state. For example, in one northern Virginia city, statistics indicated a 22% unfavorable rating of law enforcement response to the needs of sexual assault victims. When this information was presented to the chief of police, department policies and procedures were changed to improve interactions with sexual assault victims and to decrease the unfavorable ratings of law enforcement. On a short-term basis, staff members from the sexual assault crisis agency were brought into meetings to train, educate, and increase the sensitivity of officers. On a long-term basis, the department is reviewing overall operations to improve services to victims of sexual assault.

V. Brooklyn and Bronx Case Study (Domestic Violence Court Technology Application and Resource Link)

Working in partnership with the New York State Unified Court System, the Center for Court Innovation has developed and implemented a Domestic Violence Court Technology Application and Resource Link (Technology Application) in the Brooklyn Domestic Violence Court and the Bronx Domestic Violence Court. The Center is a public/private partnership of the New York State Unified Court System and the Fund for the City of New York. The Center works closely with the New York State Unified Court System's Office of Court Administration to develop and sustain new courts, such as the Brooklyn and Bronx Domestic Violence Courts, the Midtown Community Court, and the Manhattan Family Treatment Court, and to expand court innovations statewide.⁷

The Technology Application is a comprehensive web-based intranet system that provides electronic links between the specialized domestic violence courts, district attorneys offices, probation, victim advocates, and treatment providers.⁸ Through these electronic links, the Technology Application facilitates

⁷ "New York State Domestic Violence Courts," Center for Court Innovation.

⁸ "Domestic Violence Court Technology Application User Manual," Center for Court Innovation (currently in draft pending approval of the Department of Justice).

court case processing; tracking defendants' compliance with court-ordered batterer intervention, substance abuse treatment, and other terms of pre-trial release and probation; reporting alleged violations of protection orders; and coordinating service delivery to victims. A recent addition to the Technology Application is the on-line creation of orders of protection, which will be uploaded automatically (although not yet directly) to New York State's Domestic Violence Registry. The Technology Application runs on a court-based server housed in the state of New York Office of Court Administration in Albany.

The Technology Application has important mechanisms to ensure the security of information maintained in the database and transmitted within and across the system partners. The first level of security is a proprietary Intranet tool run with Microsoft's Internet Information Server. This tool renders the system unavailable to the public. Access to the Technology Application can be achieved only through dedicated phone lines or by logging in to a secure Intranet address. When a user has connected to the Technology Application, the second level of security requires the user to enter a personal login and password. The personal login and password control access to the various components of the Technology Application. The level and type of access are determined by clearly defined criteria, including agency identification and employment position within the agency. In addition to these access controls, the Technology Application database logs and records all actions in the Technology Application, including data updates, deletions, and inquiries. These actions can be traced to the individual user.⁹

The design and implementation of the Technology Application exemplify the strategic planning and collaboration that are essential to creating effective technology systems. Moreover, the development of the Technology Application has been one of the relatively few projects that truly addressed the goals of the data collection and communication system purpose area of the STOP grant program. First, the Technology Application actually is a data collection and communication system. It contains data entered by the various partners in the system, it provides electronic links to the data for system users, and it contains appropriate security features. Second, it was developed in a true collaboration among the criminal justice system and service provider partners. Finally, the Technology Application presents information to judges, clerks, prosecutors, advocates, service providers, probation, and law enforcement to provide a more effective criminal justice system response to domestic violence that promotes victim safety and increases defendant accountability.

Strategic planning. The Domestic Violence Court Technology Application and Resource Link was designed in collaboration with an advisory board composed of high-level representatives of criminal justice system agencies, victim service providers, and treatment providers. This advisory board

⁹ "Domestic Violence Court Technology Application User Manual," Center for Court Innovation (currently in draft pending approval of the Department of Justice).

collaborated with the Center for Court Innovation in conducting a thorough needs assessment of the partners already working together in the Brooklyn Domestic Violence Court and the Bronx Domestic Violence Court. In the development of the Technology Application, the Center for Court Innovation built on its experiences in implementing other problem-solving courts in New York, as well as the good relationships Center staff have developed with partners in the Brooklyn and Bronx Domestic Violence Courts.

The Technology Application was implemented first in the Brooklyn Domestic Violence Court, which has a significantly lower caseload (approximately 450-500 felony cases per year) than does the Bronx Domestic Violence Court, which handles approximately 2500 misdemeanors at any one time. Starting with the lower volume court has allowed the Center and the partners to identify and try to work out problems before moving to a higher volume court. The ultimate goal is to implement the system statewide, but as noted below, there are some technology hurdles to overcome to accomplish this goal.

The Center also has made strategic use of funds to develop the Technology Application. VAWA STOP grant funds are being used to build the system for the Bronx Domestic Violence Court established in the Bronx Criminal Court, while VAWA Grants to Encourage Arrest funds are supporting implementation of the Technology Application for the Brooklyn Domestic Violence Court. State Justice Institute funds have been used to link criminal justice system partners, non-court victim service agencies, and batterers' treatment programs to the Brooklyn Court.

Collaboration. As the design stage for the Technology Application moved forward, Center staff consulted with line-staff of the system partners in an attempt to ensure that the Technology Application addressed the partners' operational needs and practice and security concerns. Just as the Technology Application was to be rolled-out, the lead technology staff left the Center. Although this circumstance could have spelled trouble for the Technology Application, the Center was able to replace the departing staff with a highly competent technology coordinator who had worked for the New York State Unified Court System Division of Technology. Because she was familiar with court operations and information systems, the new lead technologist strengthened the already well-established relationships with the system partners and the line-users. As implementation proceeded, the Center's domestic violence program staff and technology staff have continued to work closely with the direct users of the Technology Application, including judges, court clerks, resource coordinators in the court, district attorneys, victim advocates, and treatment providers. Through regular meetings, close monitoring, and hands-on assistance in the courthouses, Center staff and the users of the Technology application collaborated to identify, address, and solve problems.

The data collection and communication system. The data in the Technology Application is presented in windows-based screens that allow the user to view and enter data through a graphic user interface. The Technology Application window has two frames. The frame on the left is a Worksheet that contains a list of links to all the data entry screens (e.g., Calendar, Appearance History, Family Profile, Compliance History, Search DV Registry). The Worksheet allows the user to navigate through the Technology Application by clicking on the links. The Worksheets are tailored to the different types of user based on the user's role and responsibility in the system. The frame on the right contains the data entry screens and displays the information associated with each link on the Worksheet.¹⁰

The Technology Application system has three basic functions. The first is as a case management system for the Brooklyn and Bronx Domestic Violence Courts. The Technology Application allows court users to electronically calendar cases, enter and dispose of charges, create or add to a family profile, and make courtroom and other notes about the case. The Technology Application also produces appearance histories, charge histories, case contacts, and reports of pending orders of protection. In the future, the Technology Application also will produce court forms in addition to orders of protection.

The second function is monitoring compliance with court-ordered batterer intervention, treatment programs, and orders of protection. Service providers enter treatment and compliance information from their offices; this information appears in real time on various compliance screens accessible by the court. With their clients' consent, victim advocates enter information about violations of orders of protection and other signs of danger reported by victims, as well as information about service delivery for victims. They also enter information provided by the victim to create a family profile. The courts' resource coordinators, judges, authorized criminal justice system partners, batterer treatment programs, and victim service agencies can access the screens that are relevant to their role in the system (e.g., batterer intervention programs can access information about their clients only).

The third function of the Technology Application is the production and transmission of electronic orders of protection. This feature of the Technology Application provides a significant advance from the system it replaced. Previously, orders of protection were completed by hand, usually in the courtroom, with six carbon copies that were distributed to the District Attorney, the court, and the state police. This process was time consuming and the copies became increasingly illegible through the six sheets of paper. The Technology Application now provides an electronic signature by the judge and by the defendant through electronic signature pads. Criminal justice system partners can print out their own copies from their offices, although a paper copy also is

¹⁰ "Domestic Violence Court Technology Application User Manual," Center for Court Innovation (currently in draft pending approval of the Department of Justice).

provided through the traditional method of distribution by court security staff. In the near future, the Technology Application will be able to upload signed orders on a real time basis into a file that then will be transmitted to the state protection order registry maintained by the New York State Unified Court System's Division of Technology. This capability will increase victim safety by reducing the lag time between the issuance of the order and its entry into the registry and by ensuring the accuracy of the order. It also will save resources currently devoted to entering orders manually.

Lessons learned. In the development of most new processes, programs, or systems, unanticipated issues arise, resources are not as extensive as needed, participants in the project have competing priorities, and tasks require more time than expected. The experience of the Center for Court Innovation and the Office of Court Administration (OCA) has been consistent with this scenario. Moreover, the challenges in implementing the Technology Application have been heightened because the project bridges bureaucracies. It therefore has required greater communication, time, and effort to understand the constraints, processes, and priorities of the various partners in the project. The Center and OCA have made diligent efforts to address the many operational, technical, and political challenges inherent in instituting a radically new way of doing business.

The lessons learned in developing and implementing the Domestic Violence Court Technology Application and Resources Link relate to systems linkages, software programming, and communications with participants. These issues are addressed below.

System linkages. The Technology Application does not link with the Criminal History System (CRIMS), which covers the five counties in New York City and three other adjacent counties. CRIMS is fingerprint based, contains all criminal cases in the eight counties, and can produce a rap sheet on the defendant. The court must access CRIMS to obtain information needed to initialize the case and to update cases as they proceed through the system. The Technology Application therefore requires double work for the court. Court events and outcomes must be updated in both the Technology Application and CRIMS. Although the added data entry and retrieval time is not a problem in the Brooklyn Domestic Violence Court, which handles felonies and has a lower caseload (450-500 cases per year), the added work will become particularly burdensome at the misdemeanor level (e.g., 2500 cases are pending at any given time in the Bronx Domestic Violence Court). The Technology Application should be interfaced with CRIMS to permit both the initialization of the record in the Technology Application and updates to CRIMS triggered from updates to the Technology Application.

Programming. At the time the Technology Application was written, the OCA was moving to Java as its standard programming language. Programming the Technology Application in Java would have facilitated its implementation in

other courts. Although the Center and OCA expect to implement the Technology Application in the Bronx Felony Domestic Violence Court and in Queens and Westchester County, the process would have been more straightforward if the application had been written in Java. A key complicating factor for implementing the Technology Application is maintaining the application after it is in place. To be implemented more broadly in New York, the Technology Application must be written in Java to conform to OCA standards. This step must be taken for other court applications as well because OCA also is migrating to an operating system that requires the Java standard. Resources will be needed to accomplish all the programming changes, which may slow the progress of institutionalizing the Technology Application statewide. Because technology infrastructure changes are inevitable as system needs change, technology planners should be vigilant in ensuring that new applications conform to the technology standards that institutionalization of the innovation will require.

Communication. It has become axiomatic that we underestimate the need to communicate by tenfold. Although the Center for Court Innovation focused on this need, the complexity of the Technology Application required even more communication to ensure that the technology development would truly support the users. Fortunately, the technology lead staff that came on-board the project just as implementation began had the knowledge of the court system and the communication skills necessary to make the Technology Application responsive to the users' needs. Although the evolution of the Technology Application from an idea to reality had its share of impediments, the result has been improved practice and greater communication among the justice system partners seeking to improve victim safety and batterer accountability.

VI. Analysis of Data Elements Collected by VAWA STOP Grantees

This analysis of the types of data VAWA STOP subgrantees have collected is based on information obtained from 51 subgrantees that completed the follow-up questionnaire in the 1998/1999 and 2000 surveys and on a review of data collection and other reporting forms gathered from several subgrantees. The responses to the follow-up questionnaires are presented in Appendix B.

VAWA STOP subgrantees collect a wide range of data elements from and about individuals using their services and about the incidents that brought the individual in contact with the subgrantee's program, agency, or organization. The types of information subgrantees collect includes data elements related to the program's operations (e.g., number of clients served, types of services used), demographic data about victims and defendants, criminal and protection order history, and case event data (e.g., case identifiers, arrests, case status). Table 7 presents the responses of 51 subgrantees regarding the types of data they collect about perpetrators/defendants/respondents, victims/petitioners, and specific events or programmatic information.

Perpetrator/defendant/respondent data. Demographic data is the most commonly collected information about perpetrators (55 percent). Half of these subgrantees reported collecting protection order history data, while 39 percent collect data on defendants' criminal histories. About a third of the 51 subgrantees collect data on warrant status, protection order compliance, and services offered to or used by the defendant. A fifth of the subgrantees collect defendant caution indicators, and slightly fewer have data on compliance with pre-trial release conditions (18 percent) and probation/parole conditions (16 percent). Less than 15 percent of subgrantees collect data on the defendants' civil case history or Brady disqualifier data, and only two subgrantees reported linking to a sex offender database.

Victim/petitioner data. Demographic data also is the most commonly collected information about victims (63 percent). About half of the subgrantees collect data on the services offered to or used by victims (51 percent) and on the victims' protection order history (47 percent). Less commonly, subgrantees collect data on the victim's criminal history, protection order compliance, and warrant status (most of these subgrantees were law enforcement or prosecutorial agencies).

Event data. There was greater consistency among subgrantees in the types of event data they collected. About half of the subgrantees collected data on the incident bringing the victim or defendant in contact with the subgrantee, arrests, case status, case identifiers, and case outcomes. Following close behind in order of data collected were client contacts (47 percent) and protection order conditions or status (45 percent). About a quarter of the subgrantees documented reasons for declining prosecution (24 percent). Seven subgrantees (14 percent) had data on affidavits.

Table 7: Types of Data Collected in STOP Funded Data Systems (n=51)

| Questions | Number | Percent |
|--|--------|---------|
| What kind of information is (or will be) shared by/collected in the STOP subgrant-supported data collection/communication system? | | |
| Perpetrator/Defendant/Respondent Data | | |
| Demographic | 28 | 55% |
| Criminal history | 20 | 39% |
| Warrant status | 17 | 33% |
| Civil case history | 7 | 14% |
| Services offered/used | 16 | 31% |
| Protection order history | 25 | 49% |
| Brady disqualifier | 6 | 12% |
| Defendant caution indicator | 10 | 20% |
| Pre-trial release conditions compliance | 9 | 18% |
| Protection order compliance | 17 | 33% |
| Probation/parole conditions compliance | 8 | 16% |
| Link to sex offender database | 2 | 4% |
| Other | 11 | 22% |
| Victim/Petitioner Data | | |
| Demographic | 32 | 63% |
| Criminal history | 9 | 18% |
| Warrant status | 7 | 14% |
| Civil case history | 5 | 10% |
| Services offered/used | 26 | 51% |
| Protection order history | 24 | 47% |
| Protection order compliance | 8 | 16% |
| Other | 16 | 31% |
| Specific Event Data | | |
| Case identifier | 25 | 49% |
| Incident | 27 | 53% |
| Arrest | 27 | 53% |
| Affidavit | 7 | 14% |
| Client contact data | 24 | 47% |
| Protection order conditions/status | 23 | 45% |
| Prosecution declination reason | 12 | 24% |
| Case status | 27 | 53% |
| Case outcome(s) | 25 | 49% |
| Other | 6 | 12% |

The review of forms submitted by 10 programs provides some detail about the types of demographic data these subgrantees collect. These programs

varied in their purposes. One program targeted batterers; several dealt solely with orders of protection; another addressed the need to notify individuals subject to a protection order of their responsibility to turn in firearms. The single item collected by 9 out of the 10 programs reviewed was the Relationship Between Parties. Other items commonly collected were:

- Name of Batterer/Perpetrator/Subject/Respondent
- Sex of Batterer/Perpetrator/Subject/Respondent
- Race/Ethnicity of Batterer/Perpetrator/Subject/ Respondent
- Date of Birth of Batterer/Perpetrator/Subject/ Respondent
- Employer/Source of Income of Batterer/Perpetrator/ Subject/Respondent
- Social Security Number of Batterer/Perpetrator/ Subject/Respondent
- Address of Batterer/Perpetrator/Subject/Respondent
- Age of Batterer/Perpetrator/Subject/Respondent
- Name of Victim/Protected Party/Petitioner
- Race/Ethnicity of Victim/Protected Party/Petitioner
- Sex of Victim/Protected Party/Petitioner
- Telephone Numbers of Victim/Protected Party/Petitioner
- Data on Children Living with Parties

Programs gather data that assist the program in determining its clients' demographics, but these data elements often seem to be connected to requirements placed upon the program by its funding source. Programs should gather and use data to describe the population the program serves and to analyze those demographics for developing and implementing both prevention and intervention services. Because VAWA STOP subgrantees were not required to maintain consistent sets of outcome related data, the evaluative measures that do exist may be accidental rather than intentional. Without the availability of such data for analysis, it is difficult to determine the long-term and quantifiable impact programs funded under STOP grants have made.

Reports from subgrantees about the data they collect indicate that VAWO should identify a core group of data elements to be collected that promotes victim safety and, at the same time, enhances the objective evaluation of a program. At a minimum, data elements that satisfy data requirements to enter an order of protection into local, state, and national systems should be captured by programs offering assistance to petitioners for orders of protection. For programs involved in the prosecution of domestic violence by the justice system, data elements identifying the case, modifications to the case, the timing of case events, and the outcomes of the case at any potential dispositional event should be identified and collected. Other data that permits the program to establish follow-up contact with clients should also be identified and collected. However, these data should not be maintained without the informed consent of the client and strict security measures to ensure the confidentiality of any information pertaining to a victim's location.

To efficiently evaluate programmatic impact, subgrantees should consider some basic principles when designing data collection instruments. These principles can effectively limit the amount of staff time required to fulfill administrative requirements and allow greater time to provide services.

- Collect those data elements that are a natural by-product of the information required to provide services. For example, a physical description of an abuser is important in preparing an order of protection because it can assist law enforcement in identifying the subject of the order. Data about the size and weight of both the abuser and the survivor would be useful for prosecuting a domestic violence assault charge.
- Collect those data elements that are available from the individual with whom the program is in direct contact. Contacting secondary sources for additional information takes staff time away from working with the client. When it is necessary to contact secondary sources (e.g., dates of previous law enforcement calls the victim cannot remember at intake), administrative support personnel should perform this task.
- Collect data at its lowest level of decomposition. For example, instead of collecting an individual's age, record the individual's date of birth. If it is necessary to know the age at which the individual entered the program, it can be calculated by subtracting the individual's date of birth from his/her program entry date.
- Derive data wherever possible. If, in addition to an individual's street address, the program must collect the individual's county of residence and school district, this other data may be derivable from other automated databases based on the individual's address.
- Do not make identifiers meaningful. If a program assigns an identifier to a person using an algorithm of name, date of birth, or social security number, the anonymity of the person can be compromised or there may be duplications in records (e.g., same names, same dates of birth). If an identifier is required, it should be assigned as a consequence of initial entry into a database and should be generated by the software application utilizing the database. This methodology assists in masking an individual's identity from researchers yet still allows for the linking of information for the program staff.

VII. Conclusions and Recommendations

In the period from 1996 to 2000, the majority of projects funded by STOP subgrants were designed to fill a single and, most often, compartmentalized and localized requirement. The funds were most commonly used to purchase isolated pieces of computer equipment, software, cameras, fax machines, cellular phones, additional phone lines for agencies, and other communications equipment. Some of these projects fall within a broad conceptualization of data collection and communication, such as purchasing equipment to gather evidence or to enhance radio and telephone communications. Others involve the creation of computer databases, but most of these databases are free standing and support only the individual agency's operations.

Relatively few subgrantees used STOP funds to develop data systems within or across agencies. Interviews with 46 subgrantees revealed little emphasis on inter-agency communication through electronic means; the pooling of data concerning violence against women among law enforcement, prosecutors, courts, and service providers in some type of integrated automated system; or the coordination of grant funds to local recipients towards the achievement of regional or statewide strategic goals.

The findings from this evaluation indicate that subgrantees interpreted the definition of data collection and communication systems expansively in order to address particularly acute local needs in securing information to be used to support the prosecution of domestic violence cases, to enhance safety at the scene of domestic violence calls, and to increase access to services. These uses of the funds improved the ability of subgrantees to provide services and to accomplish the general goals the Violence Against Women Act. However, these are generally reactive measures and do not advance the goal of violence prevention through linked and coordinated data systems. With a few exceptions, STOP grant funds were not applied to accomplish the more specific goals of improving data collection and communication systems.

The following factors may have contributed to this outcome.

- The amounts of STOP grant funds are relatively small and therefore do not readily support integrated or large-scale data system initiatives. Other VAWA funds, particularly the Grants to Encourage Arrest program, as well as other Office of Justice Programs grant funds have been used toward this end (e.g., Bureau of Justice Assistance Byrne grants and Bureau of Justice Statistics National Criminal History Records Improvement Program grants).
- The variety of purposes to which STOP grants have been applied to address significant and obvious needs has worked against the ability of

states to give priority to data systems at the expense of direct services and basic program support.

- Many programs needed computers and software to support internal operations, grant reporting requirements, and case or client tracking. The similarity across the years in uses of funds for data collection and communication is an indication that these basic needs were common among STOP subgrantees addressing this purpose area, whether they began projects in the early years of STOP funding or in later years. The small amounts of STOP grant funds are more conducive to supporting these programmatic and management needs.
- This low level of data system use and expertise of local agencies at the start of the STOP program did not foster a vision of applying STOP funds to the development of more sophisticated systems or attempting to integrate data with other systems.
- The growth over time in the number of more sophisticated uses of STOP funds for data and communication systems suggests that earlier funding laid the foundation for more complex technology applications.
- Larger or more integrated data system development requires significant strategic planning at the state and local level. Collaboration among systems and levels of government had not had time to develop and mature to the level necessary to engage in this level of planning and commitment of resources.
- The security of data systems is a major issue for the safety of victims of violence against women. Victim service providers often are reluctant to create data systems that can be used against their clients, either by perpetrators of violence against women or by another agency. Time and experience are needed to develop collaborative relationships and build the trust necessary to gather, maintain, and share data to improve services and outcomes for survivors of violence against women.
- Related to the issue of strategic planning, some jurisdictions implemented comprehensive data collection systems, but many of these projects were terminated when STOP grants funds ran out. The lack of resources or political support to institutionalize these data systems frustrated the goals of the VAWA.

Accurate and reliable data systems and competent and secure communication methods are essential elements of a coordinated, coherent, and comprehensive government and community system for reducing violence against women. These components may not be the most visible or immediately helpful features of a systems approach to violence reduction and prevention programs,

but they are the tools needed to identify victims, help them access services, assess system and services gaps, manage and monitor programs and services, measure performance, evaluate effectiveness, and continually improve the system. Although in most cases STOP subgrants are inadequate to fully support a large or complex data system, they can be applied strategically to address gaps or complement existing or planned systems.

NCSC evaluation of this purpose area indicates that the STOP Grant Program should continue to support data collection and communication system development. Many subgrantees reported system improvements made possible by their data or communication system project, and several subgrantees produced very useful and innovative systems to improve the response to violence against women. Furthermore, many data or communication systems would not have been developed in the absence of STOP grant funding.

In continuing to fund projects in this purpose area, the Department of Justice might consider the following recommendations:

- Future STOP guidelines and program language should specify more clearly the purposes to which grantees can apply funds designated for data collection and communication system development or enhancement. Dissemination of program materials for state STOP administrators should ensure that new administrators have adequate knowledge of these requirements.
- VAWO should develop a small set of standardized performance measures for statewide and national reporting. Requirements for gathering program and outcome data should be specific and enforced to more fully assess the difference these funds and programs are making and to produce comparative data across states, purpose areas, or other particular program categories that VAWO might want to examine.
- STOP administrators should receive training and technical assistance in strategic planning for the development and sustainability of state and local data systems both to reduce violence against women and to support other programmatic activities designed to achieve this goal.
- VAWO should promote the incorporation of funding for programs currently supported by VAWA into local, regional, and state operational budgets. Several promising projects have been discontinued because funds were no longer available. One method for promoting sustainability of programs might be to develop greater knowledge about state and local funding sources that are available to complement, supplement, and potentially sustain support provided by federal funds. This information should then be shared with current grantees and presented in grant program materials and solicitations to assist future grantees.

- STOP (or other VAWA funded programs) should promote more proactive projects, such as systems that track and share information on prior incidents of violence by identified perpetrators.
- Future funding priorities might focus on:
 - collecting standardized, statewide data that is complemented by common data element definitions
 - developing computer aided dispatch centers with automatic query capacity (i.e., when law enforcement responds to a domestic violence call, central dispatch can access court information and tell the responding officer what is pending)
 - creating direct electronic links between civil and criminal protection order databases and courts to track violations and enhance enforcement (in addition to law enforcement, prosecution, and other criminal justice agencies involved in enforcing orders)
 - developing systems to easily and quickly check statewide civil court records, criminal records, arrest histories, warrants, in custody status (jail), and photos of offenders
 - connecting local data systems to other local and state systems pursuing a common goal related to reducing violence against women.

Appendices

- A. Data Collection Instruments
- B. Responses to Follow-up Questionnaires
- C. Full Text of Interview Summaries

Appendix A
1998 Basic Questionnaire
Data Collection and Communication Systems
STOP Grant Evaluation

Subgrant #: _____

Survey Contact: _____

Telephone #: _____

How are STOP grant funds being used for data or communication systems (*check all that apply*)

- _____ Purchase communication equipment (e.g., fax machine)
- _____ Purchase hardware (e.g., PC)
- _____ Purchase software
- _____ Establish communication network (e.g., LAN or WAN)
- _____ Training to use data/communication system
- _____ Software development
- _____ Develop/improve protection order registry
- _____ Develop/improve victim notification system
- _____ Develop/improve case/client tracking system
- _____ Interagency coordination/planning for integrating data systems
(e.g., law enforcement, courts, prosecutors, victim services)
- _____ Implementation of an integrated data system
- _____ Other (*specify*) _____

With which agencies can your agency share or transfer data electronically (*check all that apply*)

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| _____ None | _____ Probation |
| _____ Local law enforcement agency | _____ Shelter(s) |
| _____ State law enforcement agency | _____ Sexual assault crisis center |
| _____ Federal law enforcement agency | _____ Hospitals |
| _____ Corrections agency/jail | _____ Other victim services |
| _____ Prosecutor | _____ Other agency (<i>specify</i>) _____ |
| _____ Courts | |

Cost of Implementation (Total): _____

Percent or amount funded by STOP: _____

Other sources of funds:

- | | |
|--|--|
| _____ State funds (general fund, grants) | _____ NCHIP funds |
| _____ Local funds (general fund, grants) | _____ Other federal funds (<i>specify</i>) _____ |
| _____ VOCA funds | |
| _____ Grant to Encourage Arrest | |

Completion Date (actual or expected): _____

1999/2000 Basic Questionnaire
Violence Against Women Act (VAWA): Data Collection and Communication Systems
STOP Grant Impact Evaluation

Subgrant #: «Subgrant»

How are STOP grant funds being used for data or communication systems? (check all that apply)

- ☐ Purchase communication equipment (e.g., fax machine, telephone line, camera)
- ☐ Purchase computer hardware (e.g., PC) or computer software (please specify: _____)
- ☐ Establish communication network (e.g., LAN or WAN)
- ☐ Train personnel to use data/communication system
- ☐ Develop computer software (please specify: _____)
- ☐ Develop/improve data collection and/or statistical reporting of domestic violence
- ☐ Develop/improve protection order registry
- ☐ Develop/improve victim notification system
- ☐ Develop/improve case/client tracking system
- ☐ Coordinate and/or plan for integrated inter-agency (e.g., law enforcement, courts, prosecutors, victim services) communication and data systems
- ☐ Implement an integrated data network involving more than one agency
- ☐ Other (please specify) _____

Please describe briefly how you will use this technology/equipment/system and how it will improve your program.

Do you share information/data regarding domestic violence with other agencies?

☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ DON'T KNOW

If yes, with which agencies can your agency share or transfer information (check all that apply)

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Law enforcement agency | <input type="checkbox"/> Courts |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Prosecutor | <input type="checkbox"/> Victim Services |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Probation/Corrections/Jail | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please specify) _____ |

What mechanism(s) does your agency use to share information with other agencies? (check all that apply)

- ☐ Transfer/exchange of information via telephone and/or fax machine
- ☐ Transfer/exchange of information via e-Mail
- ☐ Transfer/exchange of data and/or reports by non-electronic/manual means (e.g., courier, inter-agency mail)
- ☐ Transfer/exchange of data by electronic means (e.g., FTP and/or TCPIP)
- ☐ Electronic, remote access of other agencies' data from your agency location (e.g., dial-up networking)
- ☐ Integrated data networks (i.e., sharing common database/application/communications with other agencies)

Please identify any partners you might have (local and state) that will share the technology funded by this grant.

Is your STOP grant funding for the data collection/communication system project combined with other local, state or federal funding?

☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ DON'T KNOW

(Please specify: _____)

*****PLEASE IDENTIFY A CONTACT PERSON WHO CAN ANSWER MORE SPECIFIC QUESTIONS ABOUT HOW THE STOP GRANT FUNDS ARE (WERE) BEING USED FOR DATA COLLECTION AND COMMUNICATION SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT/ ENHANCEMENT AND THE IMPACT THE FUNDS HAVE HAD ON THE AGENCY/COMMUNITY RESPONSE TO DOMESTIC VIOLENCE.**

Contact Name(s): _____
Telephone Number: _____ Fax Number: _____

National Center for State Courts
Impact Evaluation: VAWA Data Collection/Communication Systems Follow-Up Survey

Subgrant Number: _____

Contact Name: _____

Agency/Street Address: _____

City/State: _____

E-mail address: _____

Phone: _____ Fax: _____

Please indicate your response(s) to each of the following questions with a check mark.

I. GENERAL SUBGRANT INFORMATION

1. What type of organization received the STOP subgrant?

- ☐ State law enforcement agency
- ☐ Local law enforcement agency
- ☐ Prosecutorial agency
- ☐ Diversion services provider
- ☐ State court administration
- ☐ General jurisdiction court
- ☐ Limited jurisdiction court
- ☐ Specialty court (please specify): _____
- ☐ Pre-trial services agency
- ☐ Probation, parole, or other correctional agency
- ☐ Non-profit, non-governmental victim services provider
- ☐ Governmental victim services provider
- ☐ State administrative agency (please specify): _____
- ☐ Tribal government
- ☐ Professional association
- ☐ Other (please specify): _____

2. What is the geographic scope of the project funded by this STOP subgrant?

- ☐ Statewide
- ☐ Regional (more than one local entity within a state)
- ☐ County
- ☐ Town or city
- ☐ Indian tribe
- ☐ Other (please specify): _____

3. In what type of geographic area is your data collection/communication system operating?

- ☐ Urban ☐ Small town/rural
- ☐ Suburban ☐ Combination (please specify): _____

4. Are you including any special efforts under the subgrant to address the issue of stalking?
☐ Yes ☐ No
5. In which year(s) have you received STOP grant funding for your project?
☐ FY95 ☐ FY97
☐ FY96 ☐ FY98
6. Do you anticipate continuing to receive STOP grant funds?
☐ Yes ☐ No

II. DESCRIPTION OF DATA COLLECTION/COMMUNICATION SYSTEMS

7. What kind of information is (or will be) shared by/collected in the STOP subgrant-supported data collection/communication system?

Perpetrator/Defendant/Respondent Data

- ☐ Demographic (personal, home, employment, vehicle)
- ☐ Criminal History Record Information
- ☐ Warrant Status
- ☐ Civil Case History Record Information
- ☐ Services Offered/Used
- ☐ Protection Order History
- ☐ Brady Disqualifier
- ☐ Defendant Caution Indicator (armed, dangerous, drug/alcohol use)
- ☐ Pre-Trial Release Conditions/Compliance
- ☐ Protection Order Compliance
- ☐ Probation/Parole Conditions/Compliance
- ☐ Link to Sex Offender Database
- ☐ Other (please specify) _____

Victim/Petitioner Data

- ☐ Demographic (personal, home, employment, vehicle)
- ☐ Criminal History Record Information
- ☐ Warrant Status
- ☐ Civil Case History Record Information
- ☐ Services Offered/Used
- ☐ Protection Order History
- ☐ Protection Order Compliance
- ☐ Other (please specify) _____

Specific Event Data (Incident/Investigation/Court Case/Service Delivery Management)

- ☐ Case Identifier
- ☐ Incident
- ☐ Arrest
- ☐ Affidavit
- ☐ Client Contact Data
- ☐ Protection Order Conditions/Status
- ☐ Prosecution Declination Reason
- ☐ Case Status
- ☐ Case Outcome(s)
- ☐ Other (please specify) _____

8. Who is (will be) using/sharing this information?

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> State law enforcement | <input type="checkbox"/> Courts |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Local law enforcement | <input type="checkbox"/> Probation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Prosecution | <input type="checkbox"/> Correctional Services |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Pre-Trial Services | <input type="checkbox"/> Shelter(s) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Pre-Trial Detention | <input type="checkbox"/> Sexual Assault Crisis Center |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hospital(s) | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other Victim Services (please specify): _____ | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Research (please specify): _____ | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please specify): _____ | |

9. Some data concerning domestic violence or violence against women is confidential and its disclosure to individuals or groups outside the justice system is not permitted under various state laws. What is (will be) the disclosability of data maintained in your data collection/communication system?

- ☐ All data may be disclosed to all system users and the general public
- ☐ All data may be disclosed to all system users but not the general public
- ☐ Some data may be disclosed to all system users; other data is restricted to designated users
- ☐ Some data may be disclosed to the general public; other data is restricted from the general public
- ☐ Other (please specify): _____

10. Is this data collection/communication system project linked to any other broader statewide or regional initiative (or will it be linked)?

- ☐ Yes ☐ No

11. Is your jurisdiction currently participating in other state, regional, or national databases related to VAWA purposes (e.g., NCIC Protection Order File, sex offender registry, gun permit registry, National Instant Check program)?

- ☐ Yes ☐ No

12. How would you describe the current phase of your development/implementation of a data collection/communication system project funded with STOP grant monies?

- ☐ Just starting up
- ☐ Initial development begun
- ☐ Development stage complete
- ☐ Starting implementation
- ☐ Implementation completed
- ☐ Project completed (for time-limited projects)
- ☐ Terminated without success
- ☐ Other (please specify) _____
- _____
- _____
- _____

III. OUTCOMES OF STOP GRANT-FUNDED DATA COLLECTION/ COMMUNICATION SYSTEM

13. How is the information in the data collection/communication system used (or will it be used)?

- ☐ Tracking domestic violence activity
- ☐ Tracking stalking activity
- ☐ Monitoring police case processing
- ☐ Monitoring prosecutorial case processing
- ☐ Monitoring court case processing
- ☐ Tracking client history
- ☐ Tracking client's use of services
- ☐ Tracking defendant/batterer history
- ☐ Tracking defendant/batterer use of services
- ☐ Generating scheduled reports/statistics
- ☐ Generating ad hoc reports/statistics
- ☐ Information exchange within the justice system or victim services
- ☐ Internal evaluation
- ☐ External evaluation
- ☐ Research
- ☐ Evaluation of STOP grant-funded project activities
- ☐ Other (please specify) _____

14. In what formats is the data from the data collection/communication system available for data analysis (or will it be available)?

- ☐ Individual case data (case by case)
- ☐ Aggregated case data by specified variables (ad hoc queries)
- ☐ Aggregated predefined summary reports (e.g., the number of orders expiring in month Y)
- ☐ Full cross variable analysis using not only the data collection/communication system but any linked system as well (predefined or ad hoc, e.g., individuals with prior criminal records against whom orders were issued)
- ☐ Other (please specify) _____

15. Is the data collection/communication system used to facilitate enforcement of the full faith and credit provisions for protection orders (or will it be used)?

- ☐ No
- ☐ Yes, within state (e.g., local enforcement of tribal court protection orders outside of Indian country)
- ☐ Yes, across state lines
- ☐ Yes, both within the state and across state lines

16. Has the existence of this data collection/communication system affected your response to violence against women in any of the following ways?

- ☐ More reliable/immediate information on which to base decisions
- ☐ Improved police response due to available information on prior incidents
- ☐ Stronger enforcement of protection orders through their collection in a centralized registry
- ☐ Earlier identification of domestic violence/sexual assault cases
- ☐ Increased case tracking for district attorney accountability
- ☐ Sentencing enhancements for repeat offenders not previously tracked
- ☐ Increased batterer accountability through the ability to track compliance
- ☐ Stronger linkages across agencies to provide a more coordinated response to victims
- ☐ Better able to provide services to victims because of enhanced communication across agencies
- ☐ Increased victim safety through notification measures
- ☐ Other (please specify) _____

17. Are you gathering information to measure this impact?

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, statistical data |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, ratings from system users | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, ratings from victims |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, other type(s) of information | |

IV. FUNDING AND SUPPORT FOR DATA COLLECTION AND COMMUNICATION SYSTEM

18. How likely would a data collection/communication system have been developed in your jurisdiction without STOP grant funds? Please circle a response.

| | | | | |
|---------------|---|-----------------|---|-------------|
| Very unlikely | | somewhat likely | | Very likely |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

19. Approximately what percentage of this STOP subgrant is (was) supporting your data collection/communication system project?

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 100% STOP subgrant-funded | <input type="checkbox"/> 25% STOP subgrant funded |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 75% STOP subgrant-funded | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than 25% STOP subgrant-funded |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 50% STOP subgrant funded | |

20. Approximately what percentage does (did) the STOP subgrant funds contribute to the total budget for your data collection/communication system project?

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 100% STOP subgrant-funded | <input type="checkbox"/> 25% STOP subgrant funded |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 75% STOP subgrant-funded | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than 25% STOP subgrant-funded |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 50% STOP subgrant funded | |

21. Will this data collection/communication system be maintained without STOP grant funds (i.e., has the budget for the data collection/communication system been integrated into your organization's normal operating budget)?

- ☐ Permanent financial support already included in budget (please specify responsible agency)
- ☐ Plans are in place to permanently fund the system
- ☐ Project is not likely to continue without STOP grant funds
- ☐ Other (please specify) _____

V. PRE-STOP GRANT DATA COLLECTION AND COMMUNICATION SYSTEM ACTIVITIES

22. Did you have any type of data collection/communication system supporting VAWA purposes prior to receipt of STOP grant funds?

- ☐ NO
- ☐ YES
 - ☐ Manual data collection
 - ☐ Intra-agency data system (e.g., tracking of DV incidents separate from incident reporting system)
 - ☐ Intra-agency electronic communication
 - ☐ Inter-agency electronic communication
 - ☐ FAX
 - ☐ E-Mail
 - ☐ Electronic bulletin board
 - ☐ Domestic violence/stalking listserv
 - ☐ Batterer or victim services reservation listserv
 - ☐ Inter-agency integrated data system
 - ☐ Shared database/communications network (different agencies accessing same software & database)
 - ☐ Integrated data system (different agencies with different software applications and databases automatically sharing data based on pre-determined criteria, e.g., victim notification electronically generated based on changes in prisoner status or entry of a protection order into a registry which law enforcement can access triggered by the entry of the minute order in the court's case management system)
 - ☐ Other data collection or communication system

**Follow-up Telephone Interview Questions:
Data Collection/Communication System Description**

1. Within an integrated data collection/communication system, which organization has responsibility for the system's technical operations (application maintenance, houses the database, maintains the communications network, etc.)
2. What is your governance structure for the integrated data collection/communication system? For example, policy decisions are made by board of directors comprised of organization executives and operational and technical decisions made by cross-organizational committees of appropriate staff or the system is, under the authority of a single organization.
3. What is the authority supporting your governance structure (memorandum of understanding, inter-agency cooperative agreement, defined and specified by statute, etc.) of the data collection/communication system?
4. What are your standards for timeliness of data entry and query response for your data collection/communication system?
5. Who is responsible for data accuracy, data integrity, and data quality within your data collection/communication system?
6. Who is responsible for the integrity of the data collection/communication system from a technical standpoint?
7. Who is responsible for the integrity of the data collection/communication system from an operational standpoint?
8. Who was (is) involved in the development of the data collection/communication system? Please provide the official name of the collaborating agency.
 - State law enforcement agency*
 - Local law enforcement agency*
 - Prosecutorial agency*
 - Diversion services provider*
 - State court administration*
 - General jurisdiction court*
 - Limited jurisdiction court*
 - Specialty court*
 - Pre-trial services agency*
 - Probation, parole, or other correctional agency*
 - Non-profit, non-governmental victim services provider*
 - Governmental victim services provider*
 - State administrative agency (specify type such as judicial, victim services, public safety)*
 - Tribal government*
 - Professional association*
 - Other (specify)*
9. Did (are) you solicit(ing) input about design and operation directly from the system's users?

10. Who was (is) involved in the implementation of the data collection/communication system?
Please provide the official name of the collaborating agency.

State law enforcement agency

Local law enforcement agency

Prosecutorial agency

Diversion services provider

State court administration

General jurisdiction court

Limited jurisdiction court

Specialty court

Pre-trial services agency

Probation, parole, or other correctional agency

Non-profit, non-governmental victim services provider

Governmental victim services provider

State administrative agency (specify type such as judicial, victim services, public safety)

Tribal government

Professional association

Other (specify)

11. What obstacles have you encountered (or that you anticipate) during the development/implementation of the data collection/communication system? How did you resolve or overcome these obstacles?

Policy

Operational

Technical

12. Has your data collection/communication system had any unintended positive consequences?

13. Whom can we contact to get more specific information about system development, implementation, and technical requirements?

Appendix B
RESPONSES TO 1999 FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONNAIRE
(n=36)

| QUESTION | Number of subgrants |
|---|---------------------|
| What type of organization received the STOP subgrant? | |
| State law enforcement agency | 3 |
| Local law enforcement agency | 10 |
| Prosecutorial agency | 9 |
| Diversion services provider | 0 |
| State court administration | 2 |
| General jurisdiction court | 0 |
| Limited jurisdiction court | 0 |
| Specialty court | 0 |
| Pre-trial services agency | 1 |
| Probation, parole, or other correctional agency | 4 |
| Non-profit, non-governmental victim services provider | 16 |
| Governmental victim services provider | 0 |
| State administrative agency | 6 |
| Tribal government | 0 |
| Professional association | 0 |
| Other | 6 |
| What is the geographic scope of the project funded by this STOP subgrant? | |
| Statewide | 13 |
| Regional | 3 |
| County | 16 |
| Town or city | 3 |
| Indian tribe | 0 |
| Other | 3 |
| In what type of geographic area is your data collection/communication system operating? | |
| Urban | 7 |
| Suburban | 2 |
| Small town/rural | 16 |
| Combination | 15 |
| Are you including any special efforts under the subgrant to address the issue of stalking? | |
| Yes | 12 |
| No | 21 |
| In which year(s) have you received STOP grant funding for your project? | |
| FY95 | 5 |
| FY96 | 13 |
| FY97 | 22 |
| FY98 | 24 |
| Do you anticipate continuing to receive STOP grant funds? | |
| Yes | 28 |
| No | 5 |

| QUESTION | Number of subgrants |
|--|---------------------|
| What kind of information is (or will be) shared by/collected in the STOP subgrant-supported data collection/communication system? | |
| Perpetrator/Defendant/Respondent Data | |
| Demographic | 17 |
| Criminal history | 11 |
| Warrant status | 10 |
| Civil case history | 5 |
| Services offered/used | 11 |
| Protection order history | 17 |
| Brady disqualifier | 4 |
| Defendant caution indicator | 6 |
| Pre-trial release conditions compliance | 6 |
| Protection order compliance | 11 |
| Probation/parole conditions compliance | 5 |
| Link to sex offender database | 2 |
| Other | 7 |
| Victim/Petitioner Data | |
| Demographic | 20 |
| Criminal history | 6 |
| Warrant status | 5 |
| Civil case history | 5 |
| Services offered/used | 19 |
| Protection order history | 18 |
| Protection order compliance | 6 |
| Other | 13 |
| Specific Event Data | |
| Case identifier | 16 |
| Incident | 17 |
| Arrest | 18 |
| Affidavit | 4 |
| Client contact data | 15 |
| Protection order conditions/status | 14 |
| Prosecution declination reason | 7 |
| Case status | 18 |
| Case outcome(s) | 17 |
| Other | 6 |

| QUESTION | Number of subgrants |
|---|---------------------|
| Who is (will be) using/sharing this information? | |
| State law enforcement | 13 |
| Local law enforcement | 29 |
| Prosecution | 24 |
| Pre-trial services | 5 |
| Pre-trial detention | 3 |
| Courts | 15 |
| Probation | 4 |
| Correctional services | 6 |
| Shelter(s) | 12 |
| Sexual assault crisis center | 9 |
| Hospital(s) | 4 |
| Other victim services | 12 |
| Research | 3 |
| Other | 4 |
| What is (will be) the disclosability of data maintained in your data collection/communication system? | |
| All data may be disclosed to all system users and the general public | 0 |
| All data may be disclosed to all system users but not the general public | 8 |
| Some data may be disclosed to all system users; other data is restricted to designated users | 13 |
| Some data may be disclosed to the general public; other data is restricted from the general public | 9 |
| Other | 6 |
| Is this data collection/communication system project linked (or will be linked) to any other broader statewide or regional initiative? | |
| Yes | 9 |
| No | 23 |
| Is your jurisdiction currently participating in other state, regional, or national databases related to VAWA purposes? | |
| Yes | 21 |
| No | 13 |
| How would you describe the current phase of your development/implementation of a data collection/communication system project funded with STOP grant monies? | |
| Just starting up | 4 |
| Initial development begun | 6 |
| Development stage complete | 2 |
| Starting implementation | 6 |
| Implementation completed | 10 |
| Project completed | 6 |
| Terminated without success | 0 |
| Other | 7 |

| QUESTION | Number of subgrants |
|---|---------------------|
| How is the information in the data collection/communication system used (or will it be used)? | |
| Tracking domestic violence activity | 23 |
| Tracking stalking activity | 9 |
| Monitoring police case processing | 13 |
| Monitoring prosecutorial case processing | 12 |
| Monitoring court case processing | 10 |
| Tracking client history | 12 |
| Tracking client's use of services | 7 |
| Tracking defendant/batterer history | 14 |
| Tracking defendant/batterer use of services | 6 |
| Generating scheduled reports/statistics | 18 |
| Generating ad hoc reports/statistics | 12 |
| Information exchange within the justice system or victim services | 20 |
| Internal evaluation | 12 |
| External evaluation | 9 |
| Research | 6 |
| Evaluation of STOP grant-funded project activities | 8 |
| Other | 5 |
| In what formats is the data from the data collection/communication system available for data analysis (or will it be available)? | |
| Individual case data | 25 |
| Aggregated case data by specified variables | 12 |
| Aggregated predefined summary reports | 7 |
| Full cross variable analysis using a linked system in addition to the data collection/communication system | 2 |
| Other | 3 |
| Is the data collection/communication system used to facilitate enforcement of the full faith and credit provisions for protection orders (or will it be used)? | |
| No | 19 |
| Yes, within state | 6 |
| Yes, across state lines | 4 |
| Yes, both within the state and across state lines | 7 |

| QUESTION | Number of subgrants |
|---|---------------------|
| Has the existence of this data collection/communication system affected your response to violence against women in any of the following ways? | |
| More reliable/immediate information on which to base decisions | 21 |
| Improved police response due to available information on prior incidents | 10 |
| Stronger enforcement of protection orders through their collection in a centralized registry | 6 |
| Earlier identification of domestic violence/sexual assault cases | 6 |
| Increased case tracking for district attorney accountability | 10 |
| Sentencing enhancements for repeat offenders not previously tracked | 5 |
| Increased batterer accountability through the ability to track compliance | 10 |
| Stronger linkages across agencies to provide a more coordinated response to victims | 18 |
| Better able to provide services to victims because of enhanced communication across agencies | 17 |
| Increased victim safety through notification measures | 11 |
| Other | 4 |
| Are you gathering information to measure this impact? | |
| No | 11 |
| Yes, statistical data | 18 |
| Yes, ratings from system users | 3 |
| Yes, ratings from victims | 4 |
| Yes, other type(s) of information | 4 |
| How likely would a data collection/communication system have been developed in your jurisdiction without STOP grant funds? | |
| 1 - very unlikely | 16 |
| 2 | 6 |
| 3 - somewhat unlikely | 7 |
| 4 | 0 |
| 5 - very likely | 3 |
| Approximately what percentage of this STOP subgrant is (was) supporting your data collection/communication system project? | |
| 100% STOP subgrant-funded | 8 |
| 75% STOP subgrant-funded | 7 |
| 50% STOP subgrant-funded | 3 |
| 25% STOP subgrant-funded | 4 |
| Less than 25% STOP subgrant-funded | 13 |
| Approximately what percentage does (did) the STOP subgrant funds contribute to the total budget for your data collection/communication system project? | |
| 100% STOP subgrant-funded | 7 |
| 75% STOP subgrant-funded | 9 |
| 50% STOP subgrant-funded | 3 |
| 25% STOP subgrant-funded | 4 |
| Less than 25% STOP subgrant-funded | 11 |

| QUESTION | Number of subgrants |
|---|---------------------|
| Will this data collection/communication system be maintained without STOP grant funds (i.e., incorporated into organization's operating budget)? | |
| Permanent financial support already included in budget | 8 |
| Plans are in place to permanently fund the system | 6 |
| Project is not likely to continue without STOP grant funds | 10 |
| Other | 10 |
| Did you have any type of data collection/communication system supporting VAWA purposes prior to receipt of STOP grant funds? | |
| No | 19 |
| Yes, manual data collection | 13 |
| Yes, intra-agency data system | 4 |
| Yes, intra-agency electronic communication | 2 |
| Yes, inter-agency electronic communication via FAX | 5 |
| Yes, inter-agency electronic communication via domestic violence/stalking listserv | 2 |
| Yes, inter-agency electronic communication via e-mail | 0 |
| Yes, inter-agency electronic communication via electronic bulletin board | 0 |
| Yes, inter-agency electronic communication via batterer or victim services reservation listserv | 0 |
| Inter-agency integrated data system consisting of a shared database/communications network | 0 |
| Integrated data system | 0 |
| Other data collection or communication system | 3 |

RESPONSES TO 2000 FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONNAIRE (n=15)

| QUESTION | Number of subgrants |
|---|------------------------|
| What type of organization received the STOP subgrant? | |
| State law enforcement agency | 0 |
| Local law enforcement agency | 5 |
| Prosecutorial agency | 4 |
| Diversion services provider | 0 |
| State court administration | 12 |
| General jurisdiction court | 0 |
| Limited jurisdiction court | 0 |
| Specialty court | 0 |
| Pre-trial services agency | 0 |
| Probation, parole, or other correctional agency | 0 |
| Non-profit, non-governmental victim services provider | 4 |
| Governmental victim services provider | 0 |
| State administrative agency | 0 |
| Tribal government | 0 |
| Professional association | 0 |
| Other | 5 |
| What is the geographic scope of the project funded by this STOP subgrant? | |
| Statewide | 4 |
| Regional | 0 |
| County | 7 |
| Town or city | 3 |
| Indian tribe | 0 |
| Other | 0 |
| In what type of geographic area is your data collection/communication system operating? | |
| Urban | 1 |
| Suburban | 1 |
| Small town/rural | 6 |
| Combination | 7 |
| Are you including any special efforts under the subgrant to address the issue of stalking? | |
| Yes | 9 |
| No | 5 |
| In which year(s) have you received STOP grant funding for your project? | |
| FY95 | 1 |
| FY96 | 3 |
| FY97 | 8 |
| FY98 | 10 |
| FY99 | 9 |
| Do you anticipate continuing to receive STOP grant funds? | |
| Yes | 10 |
| No | 4 |

| QUESTION | Number of subgrants |
|--|---------------------|
| What kind of information is (or will be) shared by/collected in the STOP subgrant-supported data collection/communication system? | |
| Perpetrator/Defendant/Respondent Data | |
| Demographic | 11 |
| Criminal history | 9 |
| Warrant status | 7 |
| Civil case history | 2 |
| Services offered/used | 5 |
| Protection order history | 8 |
| Brady disqualifier | 2 |
| Defendant caution indicator | 4 |
| Pre-trial release conditions compliance | 3 |
| Protection order compliance | 6 |
| Probation/parole conditions compliance | 3 |
| Link to sex offender database | 2 |
| Other | 4 |
| Victim/Petitioner Data | |
| Demographic | 12 |
| Criminal history | 3 |
| Warrant status | 2 |
| Civil case history | 0 |
| Services offered/used | 7 |
| Protection order history | 6 |
| Protection order compliance | 2 |
| Other | 3 |
| Specific Event Data | |
| Case identifier | 9 |
| Incident | 10 |
| Arrest | 9 |
| Affidavit | 3 |
| Client contact data | 9 |
| Protection order conditions/status | 9 |
| Prosecution declination reason | 5 |
| Case status | 9 |
| Case outcome(s) | 8 |
| Other | 0 |

| QUESTION | Number of subgrants |
|---|---------------------|
| Who is (will be) using/sharing this information? | |
| State law enforcement | 4 |
| Local law enforcement | 8 |
| Prosecution | 9 |
| Pre-trial services | 3 |
| Pre-trial detention | 2 |
| Courts | 9 |
| Probation | 6 |
| Correctional services | 2 |
| Shelter(s) | 9 |
| Sexual assault crisis center | 3 |
| Hospital(s) | 1 |
| Other victim services | 7 |
| Research | 1 |
| Other | 2 |
| What is (will be) the disclosability of data maintained in your data collection/communication system? | |
| All data may be disclosed to all system users and the general public | 0 |
| All data may be disclosed to all system users but not the general public | 2 |
| Some data may be disclosed to all system users; other data is restricted to designated users | 7 |
| Some data may be disclosed to the general public; other data is restricted from the general public | 6 |
| Other | 4 |
| Is this data collection/communication system project linked (or will be linked) to any other broader statewide or regional initiative? | |
| Yes | 6 |
| No | 9 |
| Is your jurisdiction currently participating in other state, regional, or national databases related to VAWA purposes? | |
| Yes | 8 |
| No | 4 |
| How would you describe the current phase of your development/implementation of a data collection/communication system project funded with STOP grant monies? | |
| Just starting up | 1 |
| Initial development begun | 4 |
| Development stage complete | 0 |
| Starting implementation | 3 |
| Implementation completed | 8 |
| Project completed | 1 |
| Terminated without success | 0 |
| Other | 3 |

| QUESTION | Number of subgrants |
|---|---------------------|
| How is the information in the data collection/communication system used (or will it be used)? | |
| Tracking domestic violence activity | 12 |
| Tracking stalking activity | 8 |
| Monitoring police case processing | 6 |
| Monitoring prosecutorial case processing | 6 |
| Monitoring court case processing | 7 |
| Tracking client history | 7 |
| Tracking client's use of services | 3 |
| Tracking defendant/batterer history | 6 |
| Tracking defendant/batterer use of services | 4 |
| Generating scheduled reports/statistics | 8 |
| Generating ad hoc reports/statistics | 8 |
| Information exchange within the justice system or victim services | 9 |
| Internal evaluation | 8 |
| External evaluation | 4 |
| Research | 7 |
| Evaluation of STOP grant-funded project activities | 6 |
| Other | 2 |
| In what formats is the data from the data collection/communication system available for data analysis (or will it be available)? | |
| Individual case data | 7 |
| Aggregated case data by specified variables | 9 |
| Aggregated predefined summary reports | 6 |
| Full cross variable analysis using a linked system in addition to the data collection/communication system | 4 |
| Other | 2 |
| Is the data collection/communication system used to facilitate enforcement of the full faith and credit provisions for protection orders (or will it be used)? | |
| No | 6 |
| Yes, within state | 4 |
| Yes, across state lines | 0 |
| Yes, both within the state and across state lines | 4 |

| QUESTION | Number of subgrants |
|---|---------------------|
| Has the existence of this data collection/communication system affected your response to violence against women in any of the following ways? | |
| More reliable/immediate information on which to base decisions | 10 |
| Improved police response due to available information on prior incidents | 3 |
| Stronger enforcement of protection orders through their collection in a centralized registry | 4 |
| Earlier identification of domestic violence/sexual assault cases | 6 |
| Increased case tracking for district attorney accountability | 0 |
| Sentencing enhancements for repeat offenders not previously tracked | 4 |
| Increased batterer accountability through the ability to track compliance | 3 |
| Stronger linkages across agencies to provide a more coordinated response to victims | 7 |
| Better able to provide services to victims because of enhanced communication across agencies | 11 |
| Increased victim safety through notification measures | 7 |
| Other | 3 |
| Are you gathering information to measure this impact? | |
| No | 8 |
| Yes, statistical data | 6 |
| Yes, ratings from system users | 1 |
| Yes, ratings from victims | 4 |
| Yes, other type(s) of information | 3 |
| How likely would a data collection/communication system have been developed in your jurisdiction without STOP grant funds? | |
| 1 - very unlikely | 5 |
| 2 | 7 |
| 3 - somewhat unlikely | 2 |
| 4 | 0 |
| 5 - very likely | 0 |
| Approximately what percentage of this STOP subgrant is (was) supporting your data collection/communication system project? | |
| 100% STOP subgrant-funded | 2 |
| 75% STOP subgrant-funded | 4 |
| 50% STOP subgrant-funded | 2 |
| 25% STOP subgrant-funded | 2 |
| Less than 25% STOP subgrant-funded | 4 |
| Approximately what percentage does (did) the STOP subgrant funds contribute to the total budget for your data collection/communication system project? | |
| 100% STOP subgrant-funded | 2 |
| 75% STOP subgrant-funded | 4 |
| 50% STOP subgrant-funded | 4 |
| 25% STOP subgrant-funded | 2 |
| Less than 25% STOP subgrant-funded | 3 |

| QUESTION | Number of subgrants |
|---|---------------------|
| Will this data collection/communication system be maintained without STOP grant funds (i.e., incorporated into organization's operating budget)? | |
| Permanent financial support already included in budget | 6 |
| Plans are in place to permanently fund the system | 2 |
| Project is not likely to continue without STOP grant funds | 5 |
| Other | 3 |
| Did you have any type of data collection/communication system supporting VAWA purposes prior to receipt of STOP grant funds? | |
| No | 9 |
| Yes, manual data collection | 4 |
| Yes, intra-agency data system | 0 |
| Yes, intra-agency electronic communication | 1 |
| Yes, inter-agency electronic communication via FAX | 1 |
| Yes, inter-agency electronic communication via domestic violence/stalking listserv | 0 |
| Yes, inter-agency electronic communication via e-mail | 1 |
| Yes, inter-agency electronic communication via electronic bulletin board | 0 |
| Yes, inter-agency electronic communication via batterer or victim services reservation listserv | 0 |
| Inter-agency integrated data system consisting of a shared database/communications network | 2 |
| Integrated data system | 0 |
| Other data collection or communication system | 0 |

**Data and Evaluation Questions:
Combined Responses to 1999 and 2000 Follow-up Surveys**

| Question | Number of subgrants | Percent |
|--|------------------------------------|----------------|
| What kind of information is (or will be) shared by/collected in the STOP subgrant-supported data collection/communication system? | | |
| Perpetrator/Defendant/Respondent Data | | |
| Demographic | 28 | 55% |
| Criminal history | 20 | 39% |
| Warrant status | 17 | 33% |
| Civil case history | 7 | 14% |
| Services offered/used | 16 | 31% |
| Protection order history | 25 | 49% |
| Brady disqualifier | 6 | 12% |
| Defendant caution indicator | 10 | 20% |
| Pre-trial release conditions compliance | 9 | 18% |
| Protection order compliance | 17 | 33% |
| Probation/parole conditions compliance | 8 | 16% |
| Link to sex offender database | 2 | 4% |
| Other | 11 | 22% |
| Victim/Petitioner Data | | |
| Demographic | 32 | 63% |
| Criminal history | 9 | 18% |
| Warrant status | 7 | 14% |
| Civil case history | 5 | 10% |
| Services offered/used | 26 | 51% |
| Protection order history | 24 | 47% |
| Protection order compliance | 8 | 16% |
| Other | 16 | 31% |
| Specific Event Data | | |
| Case identifier | 25 | 49% |
| Incident | 27 | 53% |
| Arrest | 27 | 53% |
| Affidavit | 7 | 14% |
| Client contact data | 24 | 47% |
| Protection order conditions/status | 23 | 45% |
| Prosecution declination reason | 12 | 24% |
| Case status | 27 | 53% |
| Case outcome(s) | 25 | 49% |
| Other | 6 | 12% |

| Question | Number of subgrants | Percent |
|---|------------------------------------|----------------|
| Who is (will be) using/sharing this information? | | |
| State law enforcement | 17 | 33% |
| Local law enforcement | 37 | 73% |
| Prosecution | 33 | 65% |
| Pre-trial services | 8 | 16% |
| Pre-trial detention | 5 | 10% |
| Courts | 24 | 47% |
| Probation | 10 | 20% |
| Correctional services | 8 | 16% |
| Shelter(s) | 19 | 37% |
| Sexual assault crisis center | 12 | 24% |
| Hospital(s) | 5 | 10% |
| Other victim services | 19 | 37% |
| Research | 4 | 8% |
| Other | 6 | 12% |
| Is this data collection/communication system project linked (or will be linked) to any other broader statewide or regional initiative? | | |
| Yes | 15 | 29% |
| No | 32 | 63% |
| Is your jurisdiction currently participating in other state, regional, or national databases related to VAWA purposes? | | |
| Yes | 29 | 57% |
| No | 17 | 33% |
| How is the information in the data collection/communication system used (or will it be used)? | | |
| Tracking domestic violence activity | 35 | 69% |
| Information exchange within the justice system or victim services | 29 | 57% |
| Generating scheduled reports/statistics | 26 | 51% |
| Tracking defendant/batterer history | 20 | 39% |
| Generating ad hoc reports/statistics | 20 | 39% |
| Internal evaluation | 20 | 39% |
| Monitoring police case processing | 19 | 37% |
| Tracking client history | 19 | 37% |
| Monitoring prosecutorial case processing | 18 | 35% |
| Tracking stalking activity | 17 | 33% |
| Monitoring court case processing | 17 | 33% |
| Evaluation of STOP grant-funded project activities | 14 | 27% |
| External evaluation | 13 | 25% |
| Research | 13 | 25% |
| Tracking client's use of services | 10 | 20% |
| Tracking defendant/batterer use of services | 10 | 20% |

| Question | Number of subgrants | Percent |
|---|---------------------------|---------|
| In what formats is the data from the data collection/communication system available for data analysis (or will it be available)? | | |
| Individual case data | 22 | 43% |
| Aggregated case data by specified variables | 21 | 41% |
| Aggregated predefined summary reports | 13 | 25% |
| Full cross variable analysis using a linked system in addition to the data collection/communication system | 6 | 12% |
| Other | 5 | 10% |
| Has the existence of this data collection/communication system affected your response to violence against women in any of the following ways? | | |
| More reliable/immediate information on which to base decisions | 31 | 61% |
| Better able to provide services to victims because of enhanced communication across agencies | 28 | 55% |
| Stronger linkages across agencies to provide a more coordinated response to victims | 25 | 49% |
| Increased victim safety through notification measures | 18 | 35% |
| Improved police response due to available information on prior incidents | 13 | 25% |
| Increased batterer accountability through the ability to track compliance | 13 | 25% |
| Stronger enforcement of protection orders through their collection in a centralized registry | 10 | 20% |
| Increased case tracking for district attorney accountability | 10 | 20% |
| Sentencing enhancements for repeat offenders not previously tracked | 9 | 18% |
| Earlier identification of domestic violence/sexual assault cases | 6 | 12% |
| Are you gathering information to measure this impact? | | |
| Yes, statistical data | 24 | 47% |
| No | 19 | 37% |
| Yes, ratings from victims | 8 | 16% |
| Yes, other type(s) of information | 7 | 14% |
| Yes, ratings from system users | 4 | 8% |
| How likely would a data collection/communication system have been developed in your jurisdiction without STOP grant funds? | | |
| Very unlikely/unlikely | 33 | 65% |
| Somewhat unlikely | 9 | 18% |
| Will this data collection/communication system be maintained without STOP grant funds (i.e., incorporated into organization's operating budget)? | | |
| Project is not likely to continue without STOP grant funds | 15 | 29% |
| Permanent financial support already included in budget | 14 | 27% |
| Plans are in place to permanently fund the system | 8 | 16% |

| Question | Number of subgrants | Percent |
|---|---------------------------|---------|
| Did you have any type of data collection/communication system supporting VAWA purposes prior to receipt of STOP grant funds? | | |
| No | 28 | 55% |
| Yes, manual data collection | 17 | 33% |
| Yes, inter-agency electronic communication via FAX | 6 | 12% |
| Yes, intra-agency data system | 4 | 8% |
| Yes, intra-agency electronic communication | 3 | 6% |
| Other data collection or communication system | 3 | 6% |
| Yes, inter-agency electronic communication via domestic violence/stalking listserv | 2 | 4% |
| Inter-agency integrated data system consisting of a shared database/communications network | 2 | 4% |
| Yes, inter-agency electronic communication via e-mail | 1 | 2% |

Appendix C

Summaries of 1999 Telephone Interviews

Administration of Justice Studies, Mesa Community College, Mesa, Arizona

STOP subgrant funds were used to implement training programs within the state of Arizona and assess the needs of law enforcement in responding to violence against women. This is not a classic data collection or communications program in the sense that it involves the collection or exchange of information concerning specific instances of violence against specific women. It can be considered under the umbrella of communication in that these programs seek to enhance the knowledge of violence against women within the law enforcement and corrections communities and to provide them the appropriate tools for response.

Tools developed by the Administration of Justice Studies at Mesa Community College include a model training program to assist probation and parole in responding to domestic violence within their client group; a practical guide to state and federal domestic violence statutes for law enforcement; a video and accompanying handbook outlining an effective law enforcement response to violence against women; and, a quick reference for law enforcement first responders to domestic violence incidents. Materials produced for courts include *Violence Against Women: A Court Response Train the Trainer Program*, *Arizona Statewide Resource Directory for Courts, Prosecution and Probation*, *"Children Mirror What They See"- An Information Brochure on Domestic Violence* (Spanish and English versions), and *A Quick Reference for Responding Effectively to Domestic Violence*. Mesa Community College also supports a website at http://www.mc.maricopa.edu/academic/soc_sci/ajs/vaw.

White River Battered Women's Shelter, Newport, Jackson County, Arkansas

The White River Battered Women's Shelter serves Jackson County, Arkansas. Jackson County is comprised of a small rural population of approximately 17,800.¹ STOP subgrant funding enabled the White River Battered Women's Shelter to make capital investments for computer hardware, software and to develop an information data base. The personal computer and locally generated data base is a free standing unit and does not interface with any other agencies. This computer enables the Shelter to collect data, information and statistics related to its operations and services, in addition to tracking court activity. In tracking this information, the Shelter is able to provide comprehensive statistical information for local, state, and national reporting. In addition, the Shelter is able to review this information to identify target

¹ Population figure from U.S. Census Bureau, County Population Estimates for July 1, 1998, <http://www.census.gov/population/estimates/county/co-98-1/98CI> accessed December 20, 1999.

populations and develop appropriate services. Information collected includes: perpetrator and victim information (e.g., race, sex, age), referrals (e.g., counseling, legal), type of direct assistance provided to victim (e.g., hotline, shelter, medical, financial, emergency food/clothing). Although these data elements are valuable, Shelter staff must manually compute reporting statistics due to the limitations of the database. According to Shelter personnel, greater efforts must be made in Arkansas to develop unified and standardized reporting protocols, coordinate domestic violence information, and network among agencies to maximize services to the public.

Rape Counseling Services of Fresno, Inc., Fresno, California

The Rape Counseling Service of Fresno used STOP funds to assist in its county-wide efforts to provide a wide variety of services to rape victims. Its staff responds to a 24 hour hotline, does intakes for rape victims, provides counseling and referral services and has a Sexual Assault Response Team [SART] program.

VAWA STOP funds were used to purchase and adapt the SART program, a data processing system that permits input of a wide variety of information about sexual assault victims. The program was developed by the Office of Justice Programs (OJP) and is widely used in California and other states to capture information about victims of domestic violence and sexual assault. Information is stored by individual case record and can be aggregated in a variety of ways, including to determine the number of victims, where the assaults took place, if there were weapons involved. All reports in the system are confidential and no personal identifiers are used.

Information obtained and stored in the system is shared with local law enforcement, prosecution, hospitals, other shelters, and other sexual assault crisis centers, as well as the general public in some circumstances. This information can be used to track sexual assaults in the community and is very important for internal and external evaluation, as well as research. Information from the system makes it possible to obtain other grants, not only for the sexual assault agency, but also for other criminal justice agencies needing this information.

Delaware Justice Information System – DELJIS

Delaware has a long history of information sharing across branches of government and between local and state entities. Its size and population have contributed to the success of this effort as have the strategic planning efforts of its leaders. Building on five separate information systems² in existence in 1989,

² Computerized Criminal History (CCH), Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR), Department of Corrections (DOC) inmate tracking system, Disposition Reporting System of the Justice of the

Delaware today provides seamless information sharing between the major components of DELJIS – Criminal Justice Information System (CJIS) and Judicial Information Center (JIC). Current participants in DELJIS are state police, local law enforcement, prosecutors, Department of Corrections, all levels of courts, the public defender, and, at some future point, the Department of Services for Children, Youth, and Their Families (DSCYF).³

The Judicial Information Center electronically generates Protection from Abuse (PFA) orders coincidental to the Family Court judge's signature. This information is immediately available to law enforcement through DELJIS. Delaware statutes also require relinquishment of firearms should a gun owner become subject to a PFA. STOP subgrant monies were used to develop a routine to create a printed notice to the registered owner once the PFA order is approved. Additional monitoring to ensure compliance with the gun relinquishment requirement is part of this application.

In this instance, STOP subgrant monies were used for a limited and narrowly targeted purpose. However, this was done within the context of a thriving, integrated environment already addressing issues of violence against women. Delaware's advantage of implementing a range of strategies allowed the specificity of this funding to fill a fundamental gap and enhance the delivery of justice services overall. This is in contrast to other narrowly targeted projects where overall goals have not been defined nor are projects synergistically linked to provide a strategic approach to resolving the problems of violence against women.

Rapid Enforcement and Containment Tracking (REACT) Program, Miami Police Department, Miami, Florida

The Miami Police Department, located in Dade County, Florida, provides law enforcement services to a large urban and diverse jurisdiction with a mix of cultures and languages. In 1995, the city's population was estimated at 365,498.⁴ STOP subgrant monies were used to create the Rapid Enforcement And Containment Tracking (REACT) program. The goal of this program is to raise awareness of domestic violence in all segments of the community (for example, law enforcement, schools, building a partnership between police and victim advocates) and provide a coordinated community-wide response. Law enforcement officers responding to calls for service were trained to assess the risk for domestic violence by the offender regardless of the type of call. This information is then communicated to the REACT unit who analyze the level of

Peace (JP) courts, and the Judicial Information Center (JIC) serving the Courts of Common Pleas, Wilmington Municipal Court (phased out in 1998), and Family Courts.

³ DSCYF, while considered a participant in CJIS, currently operates a standalone system and does little actual information sharing. They view data via batch transfers from CJIS and plan to move to real time data exchanges in the future.

⁴ Population figure from City of Miami Official Web Site – City Profile, <http://ci.miami.fl.us/cp.html> accessed October 29, 1999.

risk. The goal is to identify potentially volatile situations and promote use of appropriate services before violence or more serious violence occurs. For offenders, the focus is to hold the perpetrator accountable and to ensure that another opportunity for violence does not occur. For the victim, the goal is empowerment. Another feature of this program is the participation of the REACT unit in all fatality reviews. REACT participates in order to determine if the outcome might have been different if other or any actions had been taken, if the opportunity to identify the risk had been missed or was never presented to law enforcement, and to continually evaluate and assess factors leading to these fatal confrontations to enhance their understanding of violence and better their prevention of it.

To do this, the REACT unit provided training to all members of the law enforcement community to screen and evaluate situations to which officers are responding for those offenders at high risk for the commission of domestic violence crimes. A special response team (REACT) was created that reviewed all police reports (regardless of the nature of the incident) and intervened in those situations rated as high risk. In addition, the program provided a community-wide education campaign to raise awareness of domestic violence. Equipment to create a Local Area Network (2 PCs and 5 laptop computers connected to a central server) was purchased to support the REACT unit within the Miami Police Department. Data is currently being collected manually and is not integrated into the Miami Police Department's incident, arrest, and case management system although plans exist to do so in the future. Information includes warrant status, services offered to the offender and used by the offender, conditions of release – both pre- and post-trial, and the tracking of identified high-risk offenders through their various contacts with the police department. Additionally, incident and arrest data, prosecutorial declination reason, case status, client contact data, and case outcomes are tracked. This information is shared, but not electronically, among local law enforcement, prosecution, shelters, and sexual assault crisis centers.

Data is used to track domestic violence activity, stalking activity, monitor police, prosecutorial, and court case processing, and to track the batterer's history. Data is also used to produce reports, provide internal evaluations, and evaluate STOP grant funded activity. For the Miami Police Department, this project has provided more and more reliable information on which to base decisions, increased case tracking for district attorney accountability, provided for sentencing enhancements for repeat offenders, increased batterer accountability, created stronger linkages across agencies to provide a more coordinated response to victims, and enhanced the provision of services. Prior to the receipt of STOP grant funds, no data collection or communication systems supporting the purposes outlined in VAWA existed.

Batterer Intervention Program, Department of Corrections, Tallahassee, Florida

STOP subgrant funds were awarded to the Florida Department of Corrections to analyze data from batterer intervention programs throughout the state of Florida. Batterers were referred to programs as a condition of an order of protection, as a result of a deferred prosecution agreement or a probation order, through a self-referral, or from some other person or agency. The Department of Corrections gathered data concerning a batterer's race, age, educational level, economic status, prior participation in batterer intervention programs, relationship to victim, victim's race, age, and pregnancy status, and number of children residing with the batterer, victim, or both. This data is self-reported by the batterer on the batterer enrollment form. Program completion data was also collected. Results are preliminary at this time although they do indicate that those batterers with a substantial stake in the community are more likely to successfully complete community sanctions. This means that those batterers who are better educated, are employed full-time, have higher income levels, or are married are more likely to complete the batterer intervention program. This data is available only in the aggregate and is not linked to the facts underlying the batterer's enrollment in a batterer intervention program.

Piedmont Judicial Circuit District Attorney's Office, Winder, Georgia

The Piedmont Judicial Circuit consists of Banks, Barrow, and Jackson counties in a small town/rural setting. The District Attorney's Office serves a population of 90,783.⁵ Using STOP subgrant monies to create a route into warrant and case disposition information, the District Attorney's Office gained limited access to law enforcement and court systems within the three counties. In addition, the District Attorney's Office tracks warrant status, orders of protection, requests for services and services used by victims. Office automation software is also used to track domestic violence activity, index requests for temporary protective orders, monitor case processing, track client's use of services, and provide data for the generation of required reports. This data is not readily available outside the District Attorney's Office. Originally, the program included a web site⁶ about the DOVE (Domestic Violence Elimination) Team, the District Attorney's effort to expedite the investigation and prosecution of domestic violence cases, emphasize early intervention, educate and train law enforcement officers and community leaders, and work to reduce incidents of domestic violence. It also included a list of temporary protective orders and conditional bonds issued in the Piedmont Judicial Circuit. System enhancement and routine maintenance was dependent on specific personnel and those services are no longer available to the program.

⁵ Population estimates from U.S. Census Bureau, County Population Estimates for July 1, 1998, http://www.census.gov/population/estimates/county/co-98-1/98C1_13.txt accessed October 25, 1999.

⁶ See <http://www.negia.net/~galaw/> accessed July 9, 2002 for this report.

STOP grant funds have provided the District Attorney's Office more reliable and immediate information on which to base decisions, created stronger linkages across agencies to provide a more coordinated response to victims, and enhanced the provision of services to victims because of better communication. Prior to receipt of these funds, the District Attorney's Office maintained a manual data collection system and communicated via facsimile.

Department of the Prosecuting Attorney, City and County of Honolulu, Hawaii

The City and County of Hawaii are located on the island of Oahu. The County of Honolulu is comprised of a diverse population totaling 872,478 people.⁷ The Department of the Prosecuting Attorney is the STOP subgrant administrator and is the direct beneficiary of a small portion of the monies. These monies are used to establish dedicated phone lines for each of the prosecuting attorneys in the four counties in the Hawaiian Islands. The bulk of the STOP subgrant monies are dedicated to personnel, training and education, and domestic violence materials and manuals for law enforcement officers. The STOP subgrant funds a coordinator who arranges training and educational opportunities and facilitates meetings among domestic violence service providers. These trainings include educational opportunities regarding domestic violence awareness and response for law enforcement officers, prosecutors, and judges. In addition, related manuals and materials were developed to increase the understanding of the dynamics of domestic violence.

Thirteenth Judicial Circuit Family Violence Prevention Coordinating Council, La Salle County, Illinois

The Thirteenth Judicial Circuit of Illinois encompasses three counties. The largest county in the Circuit is that of LaSalle which has a population of 110,000.⁸ The Family Violence Prevention Coordinating Council (Council) is a collaboration of 150 family violence agencies with a membership of 300-350 service providers. STOP subgrant monies flow through the local domestic violence shelter and enable the Council to fund personnel, training and education programs, purchase equipment and supplies, and produce resource manuals. Personnel funded in part by the STOP subgrant include a full-time "protocol manager" for the Council. This position acts to coordinate and facilitate the efforts of the Council, develops protocols for domestic violence awareness, response and training, and locates available funding sources for enhanced domestic violence programs. The STOP subgrant also enabled the Council to sponsor a one day symposium on family violence issues for the public. Domestic violence resource manuals were also developed for distribution to 47 law enforcement agencies in the tri-county area.

⁷ Population figure from U.S. Census Bureau, County Population Estimates for July 1, 1998, <http://www.census.gov/population/estimates/county/co-98-1/98CI> accessed December 20, 1999.

⁸ Population figure from U.S. Census Bureau, County Population Estimates for July 1, 1998, <http://www.census.gov/population/estimates/county/co-98-1/98CI> accessed December 20, 1999.

STOP subgrant monies also provided computer equipment, office equipment, office supplies, and paid office operating costs. The free standing personal computer does not interface with any other agencies. It does, however, store independent information on domestic violence activity collected and entered by the protocol manager. The Council is looking to purchase access into the court clerk's data system in order to track restraining orders and court activity in domestic violence matters.

Iowa State Court Administrator's Office, Des Moines, Iowa

STOP grant funds provided \$200,000 to the Iowa State Court Administrator's Office to improve enforcement of protection orders throughout the state. A state-wide task force established in 1993 had determined that there was no effective enforcement of protection orders within the state. At least half of the courts were not automated and protection orders were not entered into any central database. Courts provided information about protection orders to Department of Public Safety dispatch personnel who loaded this information into the DPS mainframe database of all the criminal histories in the state.

The STOP grant funds were used to develop a system to upload protection orders entered into the court's protection order registry into the DPS system and subsequently to the NCIC protection order database. The system allows court clerks to enter protection orders into the DPS mainframe on a real time basis. The state has uniform orders of protection, but not all judges use the uniform order or use the order in the same way. Clerks load the following information into their system which is uploaded into DPS's mainframe: the existence of an order, expired orders, violations of the order, modifications, and a general screen that notifies the inquirer to see a copy of the order. Hard copies of the orders are maintained in all of the sheriff's departments in the state. There is also a feature in the system that allows law enforcement to enter criminal notations into the system. However, these notations are eliminated once the court clerk makes an entry that modifies the original order.

Law enforcement personnel have access to this system, but courts do not have direct access to it. Law enforcement personnel include state police, local police, probation, corrections, and batterer intervention programs that can access the information through the correctional link. Prosecutors can also use the system, but they must have an Iowa DPS terminal and require certification for access. Some prosecutor's offices have taken advantage of this access. Protection orders also are linked with police warrants information. Any time a warrant is issued or executed, the police can check to see if a protection order is on file, and if there is, they can serve it on the individual along with the warrant. Courts do not have direct access to the DPS. Therefore, they use their own court database and the protection order information that is in the protection order registry.

Maryland State Police

The Maryland State Police is a statewide law enforcement agency with an active presence in each of the state's 23 counties. The State Police serve a diverse population including urban, suburban, and rural populations totaling 5,135,000.⁹ STOP subgrant monies were used to purchase computer equipment (two personal computers and two laptop computers), develop an information systems training manual, and provide quality control personnel. The personal computers are utilized in-house and are attached to a local area network (LAN). Data and information are entered into the computer to generate statistical reports regarding progress and efficiency of operations. The laptops and quality assurance personnel (auditors) are utilized to ensure that information entered into criminal information systems such as MILES (Maryland Interagency Law Enforcement System) and NCIC is accurate and of the highest quality. Finally, STOP subgrant monies enabled the Maryland State Police to develop the *Protective Order Manual – State of Maryland*. This manual highlights related legislation for the protection order registry and data inquiry/entry protocol.

Criminal History Systems Board – Massachusetts

The Criminal History Systems Board provides policy direction for the criminal justice information network and criminal history repository. It is a representative group of law enforcement, court, probation, parole, and corrections executives. Administrative and logistical support is provided by a state-level agency, also known as the Criminal History Systems Board (CHSB). CHSB manages a statewide system that is accessed by the courts and all criminal justice agencies. In addition, under certain circumstances, public access to criminal history record information is also available.

Although housed on the same mainframe, court software and data reside in a different partition from criminal history record information. Therefore, it is necessary to perform two separate inquiries in order to obtain a complete criminal history on an offender. No cross-system identifier is carried between the two databases; therefore, data is not electronically linked and identification of an offender is based on similarities in demographics, dates of birth, and case information.

STOP subgrant monies were used to develop the Domestic Violence Reporting System (DVRS). DVRS functions as a protective order registry and is also used to capture demographic data about perpetrators and victims of domestic violence. DVRS, while residing in a separate partition, is housed on the CHSB mainframe. DVRS is currently being piloted with twenty-two police agencies across the Commonwealth. A separate domestic violence reporting form to be used by first responders has been developed to capture information

⁹ Population figure from U.S. Census Bureau, County Population Estimates for July 1, 1998, <http://www.census.gov/population/estimates/state> accessed December 20, 1999.

about domestic violence incidents. This form replaces, or is used in addition to, the regular offense report. Data from the form is entered into the database. The information is then forwarded to the Public Safety Programs Division, another state agency, for analysis. All law enforcement agencies taking part in the pilot have query access to DVRS.

Several obstacles limit the utility of this configuration. Law enforcement officials are reluctant to complete two different forms when each contains much of the same information. Compliance is voluntary. Until a resolution is reached concerning the use of forms, the program will not be expanded to include all law enforcement agencies in the Commonwealth. Another major drawback is that users must submit three separate queries to obtain arrest, warrant, arraignment, and court disposition data as well as information about the perpetrator and victim.

The Forensic Division, Montana Department of Justice, Missoula, Montana

The Forensic Division of the Montana Department of Justice received STOP subgrant funds to assist in the development of a DNA database for sexual offenders within the state of Montana. The Forensic Division laboratory uses the polymerase chain reaction typing method for DNA analysis and intends to interface electronically with the FBI Combined DNA Index System (CODIS).

New Jersey State Police, West Trenton, New Jersey

The New Jersey State Police used its STOP grant to link the information contained in two New Jersey automated state police systems, the Criminal Justice Information System [CJIS] and the Firearms Investigation System. Both systems are fingerprint based and all fingerprinted persons are assigned a State Bureau Identification Number [SBI] number. The linked system has been operational since July 1999. STOP funding was used to hire outside consultants to develop the system. Future system support will be provided by state police and system personnel.

To link the two systems, the New Jersey State Police built a master index of personal identifiers, called the Master-Name Index/Computerized Criminal History (MNICCH) index. The index contains the person's last name, first name, or first initial, date of birth, and social security number. The MNICCH system has two parts, the criminal history side and the firearm application side. The master name index is used to access the information in both parts.

Prior to funding, two separate indexes were used to access each system. Neither system interfaced with the other. Now, the two systems can be queried simultaneously by entering the identifiers at the front end of the system. The new application has dramatically cut down on time and has made accurate timely records available in both systems. All criminal justice agencies in New Jersey have access to the system.

The existing firearm system works as follows. To purchase a handgun, a person must be qualified to own a handgun and obtain a permit to purchase one. The person is fingerprinted by the firearm dealer, who then contacts the state police. The state police run the prints through the National Instant Criminal Background Check System [NICS], conduct a criminal background check on a federal, state, and local level, and check every national automated system to determine whether the person has been convicted of a felony, convicted of a drunk driving offense (two convictions within 5 years or the last one within one year), or had a protection order or any other court order entered against him or her that states that the person cannot own a firearm. Persons seeking to purchase a handgun can appeal a denial or check the system first before applying for a gun. At present, information stored in the system is not updated, and there are no system audits because the system is too new. The system has the potential for audits in the future.

The criminal history side of the system stores all past arrests and convictions in the state. Protection orders are stored in the court's mainframe and in the statewide database for protection orders. Protection orders are checked through CJIS, which interfaces with the court's statewide protection order registry. State police can toggle back and forth between CJIS and the court's mainframe. The state police and the court can query each other's system. All criminal justice system agencies also have access to the state police system through their 9-character ORI number, which is each originating agency's identifier. This is the number issued by the federal government for access to federal systems and is used to access the state system.

In the near future all protection orders entered by the court will be entered into CJIS, which will upload into NCIC in total compliance with the NCIC 2000 redesign. The system is also geared to store all warrant information and to produce a rap sheet. Demographic information on suspects stored in the system comes from fingerprint cards generated at the suspects' arrest. No demographic information on the victim is stored in the system.

The linked system has numerous benefits for police in domestic violence cases. For example, if police are called to the scene of a domestic violence incident, the dispatcher can enter the perpetrator's name and other identifiers into the MNICCH index. If they get a match on index name, they inquire as to whether there is a firearm application. If there is a firearm application, the system will then search the New Jersey State Police firearm registration file, which will tell the officer the serial number, make, model, and caliber of every handgun registered to the person.

Incarcerated Sex Offender Project, Department of Correctional Services, Albany, New York

The Incarcerated Sex Offender Project was designed to gather and analyze in-depth information on convicted sex offenders during their incarceration to better focus counseling services during incarceration. In addition, information was to be forwarded to the Board of Parole and the Board of Sex Offender Examiners in order to assist them in making clinical recommendations for the offender's treatment when he was released from the Department of Correctional Services' supervision. Another aspect of this project was the computerization of the offender's sexual history, age and relationship of victim(s), level of violence, and other risk assessment factors. The database would be used for sex offender program planning, research, and evaluation. The fifty-four district attorneys' offices in New York forwarded their prosecution files to the Department of Correctional Services as a primary source of this information. In addition, assessment and evaluation instruments were developed for use within this project. Funding for this project was not continued into the second year by the Division of Criminal Justice Services.¹⁰

Livingston County District Attorney's Office, Genesee, New York

The Livingston County District Attorney's Office, a beneficiary of STOP subgrant funding and the grant administrator, is located in Genesee, Livingston County, New York. Livingston County has a rural population of 66,000.¹¹ The award of STOP subgrant funding represents the culmination of the collaborative efforts of the local domestic violence agencies. This funding enabled four different agencies to enhance the staffing and caliber of domestic violence services provided to the community. These monies enabled the domestic violence agencies to hire additional personnel and make capital improvements. Personnel funded in part by the STOP subgrant includes: a full-time case manager for the local domestic violence shelter, a part-time deputy with the Livingston County Sheriff's Office to review domestic violence allegations, a part-time staff attorney with the Legal Assistance of the Finger Lakes to assist domestic violence victims with the initial ex parte civil protection and the final hearings for protection orders, and a full-time assistant district attorney with the Livingston County District Attorney's Office. This attorney prosecutes misdemeanor and felony domestic violence offenses and carries an active load of approximately 350 cases. STOP subgrant monies also funded the purchase of a personal computer for the assistant district attorney in the furtherance of prosecutorial duties.

¹⁰ The Office of Funding and Program Assistance of the Division of Criminal Justice Services is responsible for administering state and federal assistance programs for the state of New York.

¹¹ Population figure from U.S. Census Bureau, County Population Estimates for July 1, 1998, <http://www.census.gov/population/estimates/county/co-98-1/98CI> accessed December 20, 1999.

Niagara County Sheriff's Department, Lockport, Niagara County, New York

The Niagara County Sheriff's Department, the grant administrator, is located in Lockport, Niagara County, New York. Niagara County has a combined rural and urban population of 218,000.¹² STOP subgrant funding enhanced the staffing of domestic violence and family services agencies in the area. Personnel funded in part by the STOP subgrant include a minority outreach counselor, an elder abuse specialist and a family services specialist with the local human services agency. For the year 2000, STOP subgrant monies will fund a part-time advocate with the Niagara County Sheriff's Department.

Oswego County Victim Support Project, Office of the District Attorney, Oswego, New York

The Oswego County Victim Support Project, supported by STOP subgrant funds, is a joint effort between the Office of the District Attorney for Oswego County and Services to Aid Families, a division of Oswego County Opportunities, Inc. Oswego County is primarily rural and has a population of 124,006.¹³ Monies were used to support victim advocates and a trainer, provide training and information to law enforcement, school officials, and clergy, and to build a database of perpetrator, victim, and event data. This database is used to provide a definition of domestic violence in Oswego County. Repeated offenses of domestic violence are now more readily identifiable for law enforcement and prosecution. It is also now possible to better define the circumstances and victims of domestic violence. In addition, services provided to victims of domestic violence were tracked.

Sargent County Sheriff's Office, Forman, North Dakota

STOP subgrant monies were used by the Sargent County Sheriff's Office to purchase video and still cameras to assist in the documentation of evidence of domestic violence and other incidents. Funds were also used to purchase radio repeaters for law enforcement vehicles to boost the power of vehicle radio signals. This enhancement of radio coverage promotes officer and victim safety during law enforcement responses to domestic violence incidents.

Oakes Police Department, Oakes, North Dakota

The Oakes Police Department is staffed by three full-time officers and the chief of police, all of whom are trained in domestic violence identification and response. The City of Oakes is a small town community located in a valley

¹² Population figure from U.S. Census Bureau, County Population Estimates for July 1, 1998, <http://www.census.gov/population/estimates/county/co-98-1/98CI> accessed December 20, 1999.

¹³ Population estimates from U.S. Census Bureau, County Population Estimates for July 1, 1998, http://www.census.gov/population/estimates/county/co-98-1/98C1_36.txt accessed December 30, 1999.

region that created some communication system problems for local law enforcement. STOP subgrant monies were utilized to mitigate these problems via the purchase of radio communication systems for road patrol officers. This capital purchase included portable radios connected to mobile radios in the patrol car enabling the officer on foot to have enough power to transfer information in and out of the valley. These portable radios operate through a vehicular repeater and enable road patrol, when responding to a domestic violence call or other matter, to call in for criminal information and criminal histories through NCIC and CWIS (Criminal Warrant Information System). Additionally, this system is shared with the County Sheriff's Office system. Although the Sheriff's office is funded separately, this compatibility and coordination enables the Oakes Police Department to have access to an extended law enforcement base. Most of the time the portable radios and vehicular repeater are used to verify victim address information and to call for backup to enhance the safety of the victim, the officer, and the public at large.

Family Crisis Shelter, Williston, North Dakota

A non-profit, non-governmental victim services provider, the Family Crisis Shelter serves three rural North Dakota counties: Divide, McKenzie, and Williams, which have an estimated combined population of 28,198.¹⁴ STOP subgrant funds assisted in enhancing collaboration between law enforcement and shelters and to improve law enforcement collection and communication of domestic violence evidence. Video cameras were purchased for use by the various sheriffs and police departments to make recordings at the scene of domestic violence incidents. In addition, a tri-county domestic violence task force meets monthly. The Family Crisis Shelter also developed a curriculum for presentation to schools to assist teachers and administrators in recognizing domestic violence and expand their knowledge of available resources for victims. The shelter maintains demographic data on the victim/petitioner, information on services offered/used by the victim/petitioner, and a history of protection orders and compliance to those orders. The Family Crisis Shelter Assistance also provides assistance in obtaining protection orders, support groups, and housing referrals. Shelter personnel will serve as victim advocates. Data is used primarily to track domestic violence activity, client histories, and evaluate STOP grant-funded project activities. It is not shared with components of the justice community. The Family Crisis Shelter reports that it is better able to provide services to victims because of the enhanced communication and to increase victim safety through notification measures. Prior to receipt of STOP grant funds, no data collection or communication system existed.

¹⁴ Population figure from Population Estimated for North Dakota by County, 1990-1998 and 1990-2015, <http://www.health.state.nd.us/ndhd/pubs/demographics/PopbyCounty.htm> accessed October 29, 1999.

Clinton County Women's Center, Clinton County, Pennsylvania

The Clinton County Women's Center, a beneficiary of STOP subgrant funding and the grant administrator, is located in Lock Haven in Clinton County, Pennsylvania. Clinton County has a rural population of 37,000.¹⁵ STOP subgrant funding enhanced the staffing and caliber of domestic violence services provided to the community. These monies enabled the domestic violence agencies to hire additional personnel, provide education and training programs, and purchase photography, medical equipment, and computer software. Personnel funded in part by the STOP subgrant includes a part-time attorney to assist victims with the final hearings for protection orders, a system advocate who provides legal advocacy and networks with other domestic violence agencies, a part-time domestic violence/sexual assault detective in the district attorney's office, and overnight shelter staff. Education and training programs were developed to enhance law enforcement awareness of and response to domestic violence and sexual assault. In addition, forensic training for sexual assault exams were provided to nurse practitioners in order to improve the quality of the exam for the victim and for the prosecution of the assault. STOP subgrant monies were utilized to purchase state of the art equipment for the investigation of domestic violence and sexual assault matters. Photography equipment was purchased to document victims' injuries and software enables law enforcement agencies to prepare composite sketches of sexual assault perpetrators for distribution to all local law enforcement agencies to increase the likelihood of apprehension.

Domestic Violence Training and Monitoring Unit, Judicial Branch, State of Rhode Island

The Judicial Branch is responsible for the collection of comprehensive information regarding domestic violence among the 988,480 citizens of the state of Rhode Island.¹⁶ The function of the Domestic Violence Training and Monitoring Unit (Unit) coordinates the domestic violence and sexual assault data collection effort for the entire state. There are approximately 46 law enforcement agencies in Rhode Island transmitting information to the Unit. All police reporting forms regarding domestic violence and sexual assault incidents are forwarded to the Unit for entry into this data collection system. The data collection system is free standing and secure and operates in a Microsoft ACCESS database. There are plans, however, to link the system to J-LINK in January, 2000. The state funds the capital costs (e.g. hardware, programmer costs, maintenance) associated with the data system and the salary of the executive director. The STOP subgrant funds contract personnel to perform the data entry and respond to inquiries from law enforcement.

¹⁵ Population figure from U.S. Census Bureau, County Population Estimates for July 1, 1998, <http://www.census.gov/population/estimates/county/co-98-1/98C1> accessed December 20, 1999.

¹⁶ Population figure from U.S. Census Bureau, County Population Estimates for July 1, 1998, <http://www.census.gov/population/estimates/state> accessed December 20, 1999.

Helping Eradicate Abuse through Resources and Training, 8th Judicial District, Attorney General's Office, Jacksboro, Tennessee

STOP sub-grant monies were used to develop a domestic violence unit within the Attorney General's office for the 8th Judicial District. The 8th Judicial District encompasses Campbell, Claiborne, Fentress, Scott, and Union counties and serves a combined population of 120,258¹⁷. H.E.A.R.T. or Helping Eradicate Abuse through Resources and Training is the program title. This program focuses on training,¹⁸ formulating and distributing educational materials, and assisting law enforcement through the creation of a domestic violence reporting instrument and a lethality assessment. In addition, the Domestic Violence Unit maintains a database¹⁹ of domestic violence and sexual assault incidents and arrests throughout the region. This database is not linked to other domestic violence databases or other law enforcement, prosecutorial, and court case management systems. Local law enforcement agencies have either received funding to support a domestic violence investigator or have assigned additional duties to existing personnel to ensure that domestic violence reports are forwarded to the Attorney General's office for entry into the database. The Domestic Violence Unit facilitates communication between justice partners involved in domestic violence investigation, prosecution, and adjudication and service providers for victims of domestic violence.

Information maintained by the Domestic Violence Unit is used in decision-making, enhanced prosecutorial accountability, sentencing enhancements, increased batterer accountability through compliance monitoring, and stronger linkages and better communication across agencies serving victims of domestic violence. Prior to receipt of STOP sub-grant funds, the 8th Judicial District did not have any data collection or communication systems supporting VAWA purposes.

Salt Lake County Sheriff's Office, Salt Lake County, Utah

The Domestic Violence Unit of the Salt Lake County Sheriff's Office serves a diverse population of 850,000 which includes incorporated cities and

¹⁷ Population figure from U.S. Census Bureau, County Population Estimates for July 1, 1998, http://www.census.gov/population/estimates/county/co-98-1/98C1_47.txt accessed December 27, 1999.

¹⁸ The 8th Judicial District Task Force Against Domestic Violence has sponsored publications on full faith and credit, orders of protection, and domestic violence interdiction. Pamphlets on Domestic Violence Safety Planning, Characteristics of Domestic Violence, Orders of Protection and Domestic Violence, Dynamics of Domestic Violence, Teenagers: Domestic Violence, Dating Violence, Sexual Violence, Victims of Violent Crime: Going to Court, Stalking and Domestic Violence, and Domestic Violence: Effects on Children have been produced by the Domestic Violence Unit.

¹⁹ This database, developed in Microsoft ACCESS™, was written with the assistance of the local college.

unincorporated areas.²⁰ STOP subgrant monies were utilized to partially fund multiple positions to provide direct assistance to victims of domestic violence. This includes the addition of 1.5 FTE advocates to the Domestic Violence Unit. The two positions provide immediate crisis intervention to victims and accompaniment of law enforcement to the crime scene. The advocates provide appropriate on-going assistance, as needed. This may include assistance with protective orders, emotional support, attendance at court hearings, and referrals to community agencies and legal assistance organizations. In addition, the advocates participate on various domestic violence boards, facilitate interagency information sharing, and keep records and statistics of all contacts made with the community. This information includes: number and type of referrals, number of domestic violence reports received, training information, and number of victims assisted. The advocates are also in the process of developing a customer service survey in order to ensure that needs are met and services are on target. The STOP subgrant also partially funds a "civil process clerk" in the district court. This position assists victims with protective order processing by providing the appropriate forms, directions, and expedited order processing. The civil process clerk is trained to assist these victims during this emotional and unfamiliar legal stage.

Wheatland Police Department, Wheatland, Wyoming

The Wheatland Police Department received STOP subgrant funds to install a fiber optic link between the Platte County Court House, the Wheatland Town Hall, and the Wheatland Police Department. This infrastructure enhancement will support the exchange of data and facilitate access to automated information systems maintained by the county's criminal justice partners. It is expected that orders of protection will be more readily available from the court to law enforcement officials via this link. Police incident reports of domestic violence incidents should also be more readily available to prosecutors and the court.

²⁰ Population figure from U.S. Census Bureau, County Population Estimates for July 1, 1998, <http://www.census.gov/population/estimates/county/co-98-1/98CI> accessed December 20, 1999.

Summaries of 2000 Telephone Interviews

Irondale Police Department (Irondale, Jefferson County, Alabama)

One goal of the Irondale Police Department is to reduce the amount of violent crimes against women and to increase knowledge of services and referrals to the community. The Irondale Police Department used VAWA STOP dollars to help achieve these goals by funding salaries, office supplies, law enforcement trainings on domestic violence and police response protocols, camera equipment to document victim injuries, and pocket law books for patrol officers. The pocket books expedite report writing by providing ready access to criminal codes so patrol officers can spend less time at the station writing reports and more time in the field. VAWA STOP grant funds partially support an administrative position to coordinate follow-up mailings to individuals who have called police to the scene of a domestic abuse incident. The mailings include referrals to domestic violence services and agencies, a description of the court process, and a card for the victim to complete and return to law enforcement to provide notice of intent to press charges. On average, the Irondale Police Department responds to 18 reports of violence against women each month. Data and information (e.g., demographic information, total number of domestic violence incidents, and the number of services offered to the victim) are entered into an Excel spreadsheet, which generates statistical reports.

Huntington Beach Police Department (Huntington Beach, California)

The VAWA STOP grant enabled the Huntington Beach Police Department to expand its services to the victims of domestic violence by funding personnel, equipment, and training. Personnel include a "violence against women" detective in the crimes against persons division within the Department's investigations unit and a victim advocate position contracted through a private non-profit agency known as Community Services Programs. The victim advocate assists adult victims of sexual abuse and domestic violence after a report of domestic violence or sexual assault is generated. The advocate contacts victims to advise them on the status of the criminal investigation and the status of the case within the criminal justice system, provides resources and referrals, and assists with obtaining orders of protection and crime victim compensation. VAWA monies also have sponsored several mandatory and on-going trainings on domestic violence and sexual assault developed by the Department's Training Unit for law enforcement investigators and officers. The Huntington Beach Police Department purchased a computer and developed data reporting mechanisms to satisfy the terms of the VAWA grant. The victim advocate uses this computer to maintain data on the types of services provided and the target population. Statistics related to police operations, such as numbers of calls and reports, are maintained in the Department's main database. The Department reports these statistics to VAWO and to the California Office of Justice Planning for

development of policies and plans related to domestic violence and sexual assault.

Sexual Assault Recovery and Prevention Center (San Luis Obispo County, California)

The Sexual Assault Recovery and Prevention Center (SARP) is located in the city and county of San Luis Obispo, California. San Luis Obispo County is a large geographical area with 236,953 residents. SARP provides an array of services to victims of sexual assault. VAWA monies helped enable SARP to participate on the countywide Sexual Assault Recovery Team (SART) by funding the salary and benefits of a full-time SART Program coordinator/advocate and operating expenses such as rent and telephone expenses. To meet the data reporting requirements of VAWO, a non-VAWA funded administrative assistant enters and maintains data on a PC with disc backup. Another sexual assault/domestic violence agency developed the software. SARP staff have found monthly and quarterly progress reports produced by the software to be enlightening and somewhat helpful, but they have not used the data for program planning as of yet.

LaGrange Police Department (LaGrange, Troup County, Georgia)

The LaGrange Police Department responded to approximately 300 reports of domestic violence in 1999. In order to better serve its community and citizens, the LaGrange Police Department utilized VAWA STOP grant funds to purchase computer hardware to improve its access to data and data management. The hardware obtained through this grant included a PC for the headquarters office, laptop computers for road patrol officers, and computer lines and cables. The PC enables the LaGrange Police Department to access the Troup County Sheriff's Department for statewide criminal records checks, arrest histories, warrants, in-custody status, and photographs of perpetrators. At the time of the interview, the Department was in the process of linking the PC to the prosecutor's office to further expand the Department's information sharing capability. Ultimately, with the addition and expansion of computer capability, the Department's goal is to eliminate its dependence on the Sheriff's system. Twenty laptop computers enable road patrol officers to immediately access information when responding to a domestic violence disturbance and assist in the preparation of computer-generated reports. Upon returning to the station, police officers upload the reports into a mainframe at the end of each shift. The future plan is to establish links with the mainframe for immediate uplink.

Henderson County Attorney General's Office (Oquawka, Illinois)

Henderson County, located four hours to the southwest of Chicago, has a population of approximately 8,100. VAWA STOP grant monies were used to purchase computer hardware and software for the Victim/Witness Coordinator in

the Henderson County Attorney General's Office to enhance the efforts to collect information about domestic violence and civil orders of protection. The grantee purchased three personal computers and two printers, which were linked to the local network, known as the "court services network." STOP monies also enabled personnel to attend classes at the local community college to learn and master the associated software applications. The types of information maintained by the Attorney General's Office include: the names and addresses of victims, the number of contacts with the victim, risk assessment, and the type of notifications made to the victim. With this hardware and software, the Attorney General's Office generates statistical reports to gauge its performance and determine its target populations. The 1998-1999 statistical reports indicate that approximately 200 victims are assisted annually, the majority of which are women. In recent months, however, there has been an increase in offenses against children.

Zachary Police Department (Zachary, Louisiana)

The Zachary Police Department serves a population of 9,036 and has had continuous VAWA funding since 1996. VAWA monies have been used to develop training and information opportunities (e.g., domestic violence and sexual assault response protocols, brochures for victims), to pay overtime costs, and to purchase camera and security equipment (e.g., hard-shell cased motion detector placed in victim's home), investigation equipment (e.g., digital cameras and pocket micro-recorders for patrol officers to record domestic dispute activity at the scene), and computer hardware and software (four PCs and three printers). Data are entered into the PCs, which are linked to the Department's server. Information maintained includes victim's name and medical condition, suspect's relationship to victim, and crime scene photographs. Due to ongoing problems with the development of software, the Department generates statistics manually for reporting to VAWO. The plan, however, is to finalize software that electronically generates these statistics.

Council Against Domestic Violence (Lansing, Michigan)

VAWA STOP grant funds in the amount of \$73,296 support staff and operations of the Personal Protection Orders (PPO) Office in the 30th Judicial Circuit Court located in Lansing (Ingham County), Michigan. The population of Ingham County is 285,123. The Council Against Domestic Violence is the fiduciary agent for funds provided to the PPO Office. The PPO Office is open from 8:00 AM to 5:00 PM, Monday through Friday while court is in session. Pro se litigants seeking protection orders are not required to use the PPO Office. The PPO Office averages 30-40 personal contacts for protection orders and responds to hundreds of phone calls each month. The clerk's office averages 110 protection order filings per month. Two coordinators staff the office and provide the appropriate forms and technical assistance for completion of the petition paperwork. Operating expenses include equipment and supplies. Two

PCs are networked to the court's local area network. This link allows PPO Office staff to access the clerk's information to track and monitor personal protection orders initiated through the PPO Office.

Missouri Office of the State Courts' Administrator (Jefferson City, Missouri)

Missouri reports that it is the first state in the country to permit electronic filing of personal protection orders. This project is known as the "Quick File" project. STOP grant funds provided \$22,000 to the Missouri Office of the State Courts' Administrator to pilot web-based electronic filing of personal protection orders in Jackson County, Kansas City, Missouri. Three domestic violence shelters participated in the electronic filing program. A portion of the VAWA monies was used to purchase a computer and a printer and to provide a small stipend to each shelter for monthly telephone access. Each of the shelters has free Internet access through the Missouri Research and Education Network. The remaining VAWA funds were used to contract with software development trainers to train Judicial Branch staff to develop the Lotus Notes based website. The electronic filing system for personal protection orders resides on this website. The system was designed with extensive security measures to protect communications between the shelters and the court.

Implementing the electronic filing system required modifications to legal and procedural rules. For example, the judicial branch passed special rules of court authorizing the electronic filing of protection orders and the use of digital signatures. As of June 2000, 76 petitions had been filed electronically. Fifty-four of the filings were after the pilot funding ended. Although the VAWA monies have been depleted, electronic filing is still in operation today. For a complete review of the pilot project, see *STOP Grant Final Report: Court and Shelter Collaboration Project*, February 26, 1999. This Report explains the development and implementation of the web-based electronic filing and sample web pages. The Report also identifies barriers to and enhancers of success.

It is anticipated that this technology could be expanded to include access through law enforcement agencies, prosecutors, and public defender's offices. A subcommittee of the family court committee has been developing standardized forms to facilitate statewide rollout of electronic filing. As of May 2001, the forms are still in committee undergoing the review process. Pursuant to court rule, the Missouri Supreme Court must review and approve all protection order forms. Once the Supreme Court approves the forms, the "Quick File" committee will begin the process of incorporating the forms into the electronic filing mechanism and determining the feasibility of the statewide implementation of electronic filing protection orders. This will involve a technical assessment of the current electronic filing system and potential modifications and upgrades in anticipation of statewide rollout. The issue of additional funding also must be considered. The Office of the State Courts' Administrator hopes to obtain additional VAWA STOP Grant monies to fund this effort.

New York Prosecutors Training Institute (Albany, New York)

All New York State prosecutors attend mandatory and on-going legal training from the New York Prosecutors Training Institute (NYPTI). The Training Institute utilized VAWA STOP grant dollars to develop and maintain a statewide legal brief and legal argument bank that includes appellate briefs, motions, and search warrant information related to sexual assault, domestic violence, and stalking cases. The STOP grant monies were used to establish the brief bank, provide PCs to each District Attorney's office, and pay for the staff attorney time dedicated to updating the information in the electronic system. VAWA monies have also been used for training prosecutors on sexual assault, domestic violence, and stalking. In addition to on-site training programs, NYPTI recently mailed a five page circular to New York State prosecutors discussing "Megan's Law" (sex offender registries), strangulation, and date rape drugs.

Upon receipt of a legal motion or brief, the attorney reviews the document to make an assessment of the subject matter, the quality of the document, and whether it is a duplicate of a document already in the database. The attorney then removes the specific facts from the document leaving only the legal arguments. Key words are assigned for easy referencing and the document is then loaded into a word-processing unit based on Windows 95. Every District Attorney's Office in the state has access to the brief and argument bank through direct dial access. A dummy terminal is located in each District Attorney's Office and the individual prosecutor downloads the information onto a disc and then takes the disc to his or her desktop computer for further use. Approximately 200 documents are downloaded each month. As of July 2000, all transactions were executed on the NYPTI server. The NYPTI intends that the next generation of the brief bank will be Internet based.

Chenango County Sheriff's Office (Norwich, New York)

Chenango County is an agricultural community of 50,704 located in western New York and spanning 911 square miles. The Sheriff's Department averages 200 domestic violence arrests per year. The Sheriff's Department has three divisions: civil, corrections, and law enforcement. With VAWA STOP grant monies, the Sheriff's Department enhanced the law enforcement and social work presence in the domestic violence community. The VAWA grant partially funded a deputy's salary, fringe benefits, and administrative costs for law enforcement. For social services, approximately \$21,000 passed through the Sheriff's Office to Catholic Charities to fund a part-time administrative assistant and to make capital improvements to the local shelter (e.g., install a burglar alarm and purchase additional beds for shelter residents). Each month, law enforcement and social services collaborate to present trainings and information to the public. With respect to data reporting, information regarding domestic violence activity is maintained, including the number of calls, number of arrests, the nature of the charges, the city and location of the offense, and agency referrals.

Criminal Justice Services (Tomkins County, New York)

Tomkins County, located in central New York with a population of 97,656, is primarily a rural community and home to Ithaca College. VAWA STOP grant monies support personnel, medical equipment, and training. The VAWA monies helped fund the Sexual Assault Nurse Examiner (S.A.N.E.) Program, which includes sexual assault nurse examiners and a Program coordinator. The Program also purchased medical equipment including a culposcope and sexual assault camera. The S.A.N.E. Program coordinator is a part-time (12 hour/week) position located in the Ithaca Rape Crisis Program. The S.A.N.E. Program coordinator schedules up to eight "on-call" nurse practitioners, tracks statistics and services rendered, and participates in meetings with hospital administrators, victim advocates, and S.A.N.E. nurses. During FY 98-99, S.A.N.E. assisted 50 adult victims of sexual assault. VAWA monies also fund a "lock change" program to assist victims of domestic violence and Rape Aggression Defense (RAD) Training for a small fee to participants. Initial investments involved training the RAD trainers and purchasing equipment. On-going commitments include the payment to on-site support personnel in the event participants have an emotional response during RAD Training.

Wyoming County District Attorney's Office (Warsaw, New York)

VAWA funds of approximately \$35,000 enabled the Wyoming County District Attorney's Office to hire a full-time domestic violence coordinator. With a population of 44,189, Wyoming County is a rural community located 45 minutes to the southeast of Buffalo. The coordinator tracks orders of protection and domestic violence incidents not leading to arrest among seven law enforcement agencies in the area. A report is completed for every incident involving domestic violence. From these reports, the coordinator is able to identify and contact potential victims regarding legal process remedies and referrals to victim services. Additionally, the coordinator monitors perpetrator compliance with court-ordered services, such as counseling, and tracks family court activity to identify crossover cases for potential conflicting orders. The coordinator works in the community and operates out of the local domestic violence shelter. Additionally, the coordinator heads the county's Family Violence Task Force, a consortium of local domestic violence agencies, that is responsible for the development of the countywide protocol for domestic violence responses. Finally, the coordinator position conducts trainings for law enforcement personnel to increase awareness of and sensitivity to domestic violence. Prior to the hiring of the domestic violence coordinator, the District Attorney's Office was unable to provide direct services to victims or to keep detailed domestic violence statistics. The position has made it possible for the District Attorney's Office to completely redesign the way it handles domestic violence cases, resulting in better outcomes and reducing the proportion of victims who decline to participate in the prosecution of the case. The VAWA monies also purchased a personal

computer, monitor, and scanner. Using Excel software, the coordinator maintains a victim and offender database as well as data on services to generate monthly activity reports for submission to the grant monitor. However, the computer is not connected to the District Attorney's Office local area network.

Lawrenceburg Police Department (Lawrenceburg, Tennessee)

The Lawrenceburg Police Department utilized VAWA grant monies as seed money to develop its Domestic Violence Unit by funding specialized personnel, computer and communications equipment, and a patrol car. Most of the VAWA funds were dedicated to the salary and benefits of a domestic violence case assistant. Computer and communication equipment included four personal computers, one NT terminal, an interfacing device with fiber optic cables and associated linking hardware and software to establish Internet linkage with other departments, including the juvenile court. Lawrenceburg identified a juvenile target population based on the domestic violence statistics maintained concurrent with this VAWA grant. Of the total number of domestic violence cases within the city, 48 percent involved juvenile offenders and/or victims. The Domestic Violence Unit can now electronically review court records in abuse and neglect cases, criminal matters, juvenile matters, and personal protection orders. The central dispatch office can access this court information and advise patrol officers responding to a domestic disturbance call if there are cases pending against the perpetrator. To date, the fiber optic linkage has functioned extremely well and has been an invaluable tool for the Domestic Violence Unit.

When the city of Lawrenceburg learned it was not eligible for 2000-2001 VAWA STOP grant funds, it assumed full funding of the Domestic Violence Unit because the domestic violence case volume continues to grow as a result of enhanced public awareness and increasing incidents of violence. Nearly 50 percent of the cases that come to the Criminal Investigation Division are referred to the Domestic Violence Unit. The Domestic Violence Unit's rising caseload is expected to soon dictate the hiring of additional investigators and case assistants. The success of the Lawrenceburg Police Department's Domestic Violence Unit has been recognized statewide. Several law enforcement agencies have invited members of the Domestic Violence Unit to trainings and speaking engagements in the hopes that Lawrenceburg's success can be replicated.

Office of the County Sheriff (Scott County, Tennessee)

The Scott County Sheriffs' Department serves a population of 20,239. VAWA grant funding, which ended in June 2000, helped to establish a domestic violence division within the Sheriff's Office. Initial VAWA monies were used to make capital investments such as a patrol car, computers, and photographic equipment (digital camera, video camera, and 35mm camera). Later, VAWA funds were used to fund the salary of a domestic violence deputy and operating expenses (telephone line, modem line, uniforms, specialized domestic violence training, and printing materials for distribution to victims and the community). Currently, the Office maintains domestic violence records based on "complaint cards" and domestic violence reports completed by the dispatch unit and responding deputies. On average, the Scott County Sheriff's Office receives 100 reports monthly of child sexual assault, adult sexual assault, and domestic violence. In May 2000, the Sheriff's Office received 96 reports, 23 of which were referred to the domestic violence division. Of the 23, the prosecutor filed charges in 20 cases. The Sheriff's Office has decided not to pursue additional grant funding, however, because of the additional burdens placed on the department for such nominal funding (i.e., maintaining statistics normally not kept by the Office without funding administrative assistance) but will continue to provide specialized domestic violence services.

Utah Prosecution Council (Salt Lake City, Utah)

The Utah Prosecution Council is the training arm of the Attorney General's Office. The Utah Attorney General's Office performs specialized prosecutions and has statewide jurisdiction. The Prosecution Council purchased "off the shelf" case management software for use by all local attorney general offices. Although the Prosecution Council cannot mandate the use of the software by the local attorney general offices, to date the software has been installed in 16 of 29 county offices. There is no expense to the local offices other than the time for training. The Prosecution Council was awarded VAWA funding for three grant cycles. The most recent award of \$24,400 was used to partially fund the salaries of two technicians to maintain and upgrade the case management software and to purchase statewide software licenses. The system is continually monitored and improved based on feedback from end users.

The case management software is installed into the local area network within each attorney general's county office. All the attorneys and staff in the local office can access the same database and the end user works off a terminal. The case management software allows for data management on two levels, local and state. Locally, the system enables prosecutors to better manage their cases and generate applicable documents based upon case milestones. On a statewide level, the case management system compiles statistics to indicate crime trends, fiscal and resource allocation, policy development, and training topics. Lack of connectivity to the state office has been a problem, however.

Many local offices are generating the data but are not transmitting it to the state office. The next step for the system is to network all local offices to the state office located in Salt Lake City.

Washington County Sheriff's Department (Abingdon, Virginia)

The Washington County Sheriff's Office serves a population of 49,791. VAWA STOP grant funds were utilized for salaries, a dedicated phone line for domestic violence calls, brochures, and training. One full-time detective and one part-time administrative assistant were assigned to investigate and monitor domestic violence offenses. Brochures, information cards, and information packets were printed and provided to victims when deputies arrived on the scene of a domestic violence dispute. These materials also were distributed to the public at large. Training was provided to the law enforcement officers on domestic violence and sexual assault and to the community on domestic violence, stalking, and law enforcement response and reporting. The community training was considered to be highly successful in opening channels of communication between law enforcement and the public.

To meet the data and communication requirements of the VAWA grant, the Sheriff's Office developed a domestic violence offense form. Every call from 1996 to the end of the grant cycle in mid-1999 was documented with the following information: victim and perpetrator information, drug/alcohol histories, convictions, civil protection orders, risk assessment, weapons, and children. The data was entered daily from cards completed by the dispatch unit and the deputies' reports. The information was maintained on disc in an Excel format. This data system provided a data repository, enabled the Sheriff's Office to run queries and generate statistical reports, and was immediately accessible by the dispatch unit. Unfortunately, there was a lapse in the request for continued funding from the VAWO. As a result, there is no current funding for the domestic violence division. Personnel have been reassigned to other divisions and domestic violence offense information is no longer compiled, although it continues to be collected. (Additional VAWA funding was requested to fund a domestic violence unit, its personnel, and associated training for law enforcement.)

Virginians Against Domestic Violence (Williamsburg, Virginia)

Since 1996, Virginians Against Domestic Violence (VADV) has received and used VAWA funding for systematic and strategic development and implementation of a plan for statewide collection of domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking information. Beginning in 1995, Virginia formed a statewide coalition of domestic violence and sexual assault providers and made efforts to document programs, services, and target populations. VADV found that most data collection systems were inadequate and not Y2K compliant. During 1996, STOP monies enabled VADV to continue to meet to work on strategic planning

for domestic violence and sexual assault services. One of the first steps involved the identification of a common set of data elements to ensure that all agencies could report the same information. This step evolved into a larger domestic violence, sexual assault and stalking data project, initially involving the preparation of standardized forms to document domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking activity. Among these forms are the documentation of hot line calls, shelter stays, advocacy services, and prevention/education/training services.

In 1997, discussions centered on creating a statewide electronic data collection system. Based upon the advice of a consultant, VADV decided upon a web-based data collection system using a highly secure html format. VAWA monies were utilized to fund the development of the software and scripts for data entry into the web-based reporting system. After a six-month pilot period, the system went live and was implemented statewide in October 1999. The website, www.vadata.org, is accessible 24 hours a day/seven days per week. Each domestic violence agency can access the site and, using an assigned password, enter into the data entry portion of the site. All domestic violence programs are required to participate in this electronic data reporting and must have a computer with Internet capacity. When the system went online, participation by sexual assault agencies was optional because the sexual assault reporting component was not as well developed as the domestic violence module.

The ultimate goals of these data collection efforts are to improve services at the local level to meet the needs of target populations and to change domestic violence policies at the state level. Overall, the Internet-based data collection system is working well and has performed beyond expectations. The sexual assault module is now completed and, although participation by sexual assault agencies is still optional, 85% of sexual assault centers are entering data and information into the system. The information and data extrapolated from the system has been used to enhance operations and increase services to victims across the state. For example, in one northern Virginia city, statistics indicated a 22% unfavorable rating of law enforcement response to the needs of sexual assault victims. When this information was presented to the chief of police, department policies and procedures were changed to improve interactions with sexual assault victims and to decrease the unfavorable ratings of law enforcement. On a short-term basis, staff members from the sexual assault crisis agency were brought in to meetings to train, educate, and increase the sensitivity of officers. On a long-term basis, the department is reviewing overall operations to improve services to victims of sexual assault.

Women's Resource Center (Beckley, West Virginia)

The Women's Resource Center is the fiduciary of VAWA funding for the Fayette County 911 Dispatch Center. Fayette County is a small community of approximately 46,785. Fayette County 911 Center dispatches for many agencies

including: animal control, wrecker services, 17 fire/rescue departments, three ambulance companies, and ten law enforcement agencies. Of approximately 2,500 dispatches resulting in law enforcement response, 15 percent involve domestic violence. With the VAWA monies, Fayette County purchased computer hardware and records management software (known as CRIS-Criminal Records Information System) to enhance its Dispatch Center. Three personal computers and two printers were obtained as a result of the VAWA funding. One of the computers functions as the server for the records management software, one is located in the Dispatch Center for queries, and one computer is located in the sheriff's office and has remote access via modem. Two of these computers are connected to a local area network.

Much research went into the purchase of CRIS. The CRIS system appears to have a very large information capacity with multiple modules that can be added or deleted to address local needs and specifications, as well as keeping mandated criminal reporting information. For example, CRIS compiles and tracks information that is not currently available on NCIC such as suspect information and call location information. There also is a module for personal protection order information, but there is no direct link to the courts. Consequently, law enforcement has access to paper copies of orders only. The majority of the entries into CRIS are from the sheriff's office and the incident-based reporting system. The long-term goal is that Fayette County will have a fully functional computer-aided dispatch center with automatic query capacity.

Stop Abusive Family Environments (Welch, West Virginia)

Stop Abusive Family Environments (S.A.F.E.) serves a three-county area (McDowell, Mercer, Wyoming). This is the third year of VAWA funding for McDowell County. These monies have been used to hire a full-time advocate director with the prosecutor's office, a full-time law enforcement officer, and a full-time S.A.F.E. victim advocate. Mercer County is receiving its second year of VAWA monies, which fund a part-time S.A.F.E. victim advocate, camera equipment and film to photograph victims' injuries, and a laptop computer for the Princeton Police Department to monitor current personal protection orders.

PROPERTY OF
National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS)
Box 6000
Rockville, MD 20849-6000